



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

This thesis has been submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for a postgraduate degree (e.g. PhD, MPhil, DClinPsychol) at the University of Edinburgh. Please note the following terms and conditions of use:

This work is protected by copyright and other intellectual property rights, which are retained by the thesis author, unless otherwise stated.

A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge.

This thesis cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the author.

The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the author.

When referring to this work, full bibliographic details including the author, title, awarding institution and date of the thesis must be given.

Tripartite Interaction in the Community Payback Order

Author: Ralph Griff Williams

Degree: PhD

The University of Edinburgh

2019

Declaration

I declare that this thesis has been composed solely by myself and that it has not been submitted, in whole or in part, in any previous application for a degree. Except where stated otherwise by reference or acknowledgement, the work presented is entirely my own.

Signed: _____

Date: _____

Table of Content

Abstract & Lay Summary

p7

Lay Summary

p11

Introduction

Chapter 1 - Tripartite Interaction in the Community Payback Order

p15

Chapter 2 - Envisaged Social Realities of CPO Policy

p29

Chapter 3 - Literature Review

p41

Chapter 4 - Design and Methodology

p77

Case Study One - Supervision

Chapter 5 - Developing and Harnessing Client Understanding

p113

Chapter 6 - Fostering Client Motivation

p151

Chapter 7 - Problem Solving

p183

Case Study Two - Unpaid Work

Chapter 8 - The Act of Working

p215

Chapter 9 - The Mood Whilst Working

p247

Chapter 10 - The Results of the Work

p275

Conclusions

Chapter 11 - CPO Social Realities and the Concept of 'Community'

p303

Chapter 12 - CPO Social Realities and the Concept of 'Payback'

p319

Chapter 13 - Conclusion: The Social Realities of the CPO

p335

Bibliography

p343

Abstract

The Scottish Community Payback Order (CPO) came into force in February 2011, and was envisaged as a sentence that combined punishment, reparation and personal change. However, research into the CPO has been limited, and there has yet to be an in-depth examination of the CPO in practice: how those involved communicate and interact with one another, thereby realising the CPO's operation. This research project is a naturalistic exploration of the communicative interactions between the three key stakeholders of the CPO – social work officers, offender clients and the beneficiaries of unpaid work – in order to develop an understanding of the day-to-day social realities these interactions construct.

This project has two objectives. The first is to explore the internal, subjective meanings that each stakeholder interpretively attributes to stimuli within the context of the CPO and which motivate their resultant actions. The second, subsequent, objective is to use these understandings to analyse how the intermingling of stakeholders' meanings through their interactions produces a shared social reality between them.

These objectives are achieved through two exemplifying case studies: observing the frontline interactions between officers/clients and clients/beneficiaries in the CPO's supervision and unpaid work requirements respectively. By utilising a hybrid ontological approach that combines social constructivism and symbolic interaction with discourse analysis as an analytical medium, this project explores the actions and interactions of these stakeholders - the experiences and perspectives that shape them, and their consequences in shaping the CPO's day-to-day operations. These observations are supplemented by qualitative, ethnographic interviewing, wherein the same participants provide their own guidance on how they perceive and understand their place and interactions within the CPO.

In exploring the interactions that take place both in supervision and unpaid work, this project's findings offer an insight into how the CPO operates in practice. Supervision emphasised a client-driven model of change, with supervisors taking considerable effort to develop an individualised understanding of clients in order to facilitate and encourage clients' own motivation and agency to change. On the other hand, however, even collaboration between clients and their supervisors struggled to overcome the toxic, criminogenic environments in which clients lived, and which hindered and/or undermined their sincere efforts to meaningfully change their lives.

Unpaid work, on the other hand, achieved a positive, inclusive atmosphere between clients and the organisations/staff which benefited from their work. Under the correct conditions, unpaid work projects could foster a new self-identity for clients, founded in a sense of worth and contribution. However, unpaid work also struggled with its own identity: a lack of public involvement, and a fictional normalisation of clients, resulted in an obfuscation of clients' social needs (needs which unpaid work was in a position to address). As a result, unpaid work could also be a mindless series of unsatisfying 'odd jobs' with little personal or practical value for clients.

These findings have considerable implications, both for government policy and the academic community. At the most basic level, this project presents a more complex picture of the CPO than its policy depiction, with little to no 'payback' to 'communities' occurring in practice. But on a deeper level, these findings highlight not only the benefits of a client-centric, agency-fostering approach to engaged intervention, but the necessity of a broad perspective in supporting offender clients in their efforts to desist. The fostering of social capital is essential for the realisation of even short-term desistance from crime, and extends beyond a client's immediate personal network to the

stakeholders encountered as part of their CPO, and even further into the environments in which they live.

Lay Summary

The Scottish Community Payback Order (CPO) is a community-based sentence that is intended to provide a balance between punishing offenders whilst also supporting them in moving away from their offending behaviour. Offenders serving a CPO can be sentenced to complete a combination of requirements, but the two most common are supervision - where the offender meets with a criminal justice social worker to discuss their needs and challenges - and unpaid work - where the offender carries out a fixed number of hours of manual labour that is intended to benefit the local area and provide the offender with valuable job skills. The unifying concept for the CPO is that it allows the offender to 'pay back to the community', either through the reparative benefit of their unpaid work, or improved public safety because of their efforts towards rehabilitation.

Despite burgeoning use of the CPO since its introduction in 2011, however, there has been comparatively little research carried out to understand what actually happens on the front lines of its operation in practice. This research project seeks to address this, examining how the interactions between social workers and offender clients (for supervision), and between offender clients and the beneficiaries of their unpaid work (for unpaid work) shape and define how the CPO operates on a day-to-day, practical basis. By understanding how these three stakeholders perceive themselves, each other and the CPO itself, and how in turn these perceptions influence how they talk and act amongst one another, valuable insight can be gained into what actually happens on a CPO.

This research project draws on six months of observing criminal justice social workers working alongside their offender clients as part of the supervision requirement, and four months of observing unpaid work teams carrying out their sentences in the local area. These observations are supplemented by

interviews with the research's participants, providing further insights into their perceptions, and how those influence their interactions with each other.

While this research project's sample size is small and non-representative - meaning its findings cannot be generalised to the entire population of those involved in the CPO - its findings can be transferred as examples of good practice and difficult challenges faced as part of the CPO's operations. What the project's findings demonstrate is an important and productive emphasis in both requirements on the offender client as a key stakeholder: supervision emphasises fostering and supporting offender clients' own sincerely motivated efforts to change their lives, while unpaid work presents them an opportunity to engage with work that can build their self-esteem and begin to construct a positive new identity for themselves. On the other hand, however, supervision encountered serious difficulties in overcoming the obstacles and challenges offender clients faced in their own communities in attempting to change - lack of job opportunities, anti-social influences and environmental pressures being three of the major issues. Unpaid work, meanwhile, did not realise its full potential as a supportive intervention; while those with whom offender clients worked accepted them as a pseudo-voluntary workforce, they failed to acknowledge clients' particular social needs and their own ability to provide support (i.e. job skills, training, referrals, etc.).

As a result, this research project suggests that the CPO is, in practice, more complex than its policy depiction would suggest. None of this project's participants perceived either supervision or unpaid work as 'paying back to the community' - while the public undoubtedly benefited from both supervision and unpaid work, the central focus was on providing a supportive intervention to aid offender clients in achieving meaningful change in their lives. In an unfortunate irony, their 'communities' (i.e. the environments in which offender clients lived) were more often an obstacle than an aid to this change effort. This indicates a need to focus on fostering better 'social

capital' for offender clients - resources in their community, from jobs to housing, that help them realise and maintain the law-abiding lifestyle they seek.

Chapter 1 - Tripartite Interaction in the Community Payback Order

The Scottish Community Payback Order (CPO) came into force in February 2011 as part of the Criminal Justice and Licensing (Scotland) Act 2010, s.227A. Its express purpose is the creation of 'a robust and consistently delivered community penalty which enjoys public and judicial confidence and thereby provides a viable alternative to custody in appropriate cases' [Scottish Government, 2010a, p1]. This modular, alternative-to-custody penalty - allowing judges to tailor a bespoke sentence for individual offenders from a range of nine possible 'requirements' (varying from traditional probationary 'supervision' to unpaid work, compensation to programme attendance) - is held together by a unifying theme of 'payback': offenders serving a CPO are thought to be paying back to the 'community' (a term that shall be explored in its own right, but understood fundamentally in policy as either a distinct geographic area, or wider society [Scottish Government, 2010a, p1]) through either directly reparative efforts, or through personal change work to address their offending (what is termed 'paying back by working at change'). While explicitly set out as a punishment for offenders, the CPO is also claimed to serve as a supportive intervention.

Over the past eight years, the CPO has burgeoned into a significant element of the Scottish penal landscape, replacing the former sentencing options of probation, community service, and Supervised Attendance Orders. Between 2016 and 2017 (the most recent statistics currently available), over nineteen thousand Orders were commenced; within these Orders, the two most common requirements were the 'unpaid work or other activity' requirement (76% in 2016-17, consistent with a 75-80% since introduction), and the 'supervision' requirement (53% in 2016-17, consistent with a 50-55% since introduction) [Scottish Government, 2018]. The average number of hours given as part of an unpaid work requirement has consistently sat around 120 hours (122 hours in 2016-17), and the average length of supervision requirements has been around 15.5 months (identical in 2016-17

- although it is noting that supervision duration has a distinct variance with offender age: 29% of supervision for 6 months or less was given to Under 21s, with an average age of 30; 37% of supervision for the maximum 36 months was given to Over 40s, with an average age of 37). The other seven requirements are used to an appreciably lesser degree: 7% of CPOs in 2016-17 included a conduct requirement (the most common requirement after unpaid work and supervision), while only 1% included a drug treatment requirement. In 2016-17, 67% of CPOs were terminated through successful completion, or resulted in early discharge (consistent with a 67-69% range since introduction); 17% were revoked due to breach applications, 8% revoked following review, and 7% terminated for other reasons (transfer to another area, death of the person, etc.). Almost three quarters of CPOs terminated during 2016-17 did not involve any breach applications during the Order's lifetime. For those Orders revoked due to breach in 2016-17, the most likely outcomes were either a custodial sentence or a new CPO (both at 28%). Successful completion of a CPO was more likely for offenders over 40 (77% vs. 60% for 16-17 year-olds), and for those in employment (81% vs. 62% for unemployed or economically inactive).

However, the academic attention paid to the CPO has not been as correspondingly sizeable as these figures [McGuinness, 2014; Anderson et al., 2015]. As will be discussed in the following chapter, the CPO's policy context presents two complex concepts in the forms of 'community' and 'payback' - concepts that suggest the CPO is not merely the next iteration of non-carceral sentencing, but a novel phenomenon contained within an ambitious new framework. As a result, it is the submission of this research project that we cannot simply rely on prior theory and findings regarding either probation or community sentencing to understand the CPO. Rather, it is essential to treat the CPO as a novel criminological phenomenon, and if we are to better understand it as such, and not merely by what its policy envisages/claims it to be, then a naturalistic, frontline exploration of the CPO in practice is necessary.

This claim of necessity is influenced, to a considerable extent, by an interpretation of Souhami's work [2015]: that frontline criminal justice practitioners do not simply implement wider policy, but actually create policy in the course of their work through their practice. Building upon that argument, this research project takes as its central proposition (expanded upon in the ontological discussion below) that if one wants to understand the CPO as a phenomenon, one's focus must be directed not to policy, but to practice. Policy may make claims about concepts of 'community' or 'payback', but ultimately these are nothing more than assertions - an envisaged notion of what the CPO should be. To understand what the CPO is in practice, one must look to precisely that: practice. Through the everyday, ordinary actions and interactions of its key stakeholders (social work officers, offender clients and unpaid work beneficiaries), the CPO is given real meaning, activity and consequence. While CPO policy sets out a number of interesting and important values - its balancing of punishment and rehabilitation; its emphasis upon facilitating offender desistance through the development of skills, reintegration and personally-driven change; the role of the officer to monitor said desistance, maintain compliance, foster motivation and broker specialist services [Scottish Government, 2010a] - this research is grounded in the argument that it is only through frontline practice that such values are realised, if at all, and thus frontline practice must be studied.

This, in turn, raises two simple but essential questions: why and how? Why are the practical, day-to-day operations of the CPO worth the effort of studying, and how is one to achieve such a study of how stakeholder interaction constitutes the CPO in real terms?

To begin with the reasons why the CPO is worthy of study in this particular manner, it has already been noted that there exists a disparity between the scope of the CPO's influence and impact, and the contrasting dearth of academic examination into and understanding of it as a phenomenon. While both probation and community service are topics that do not lack in both theory and research, it would be irresponsible to make any

presumptions as to the applicability of existing literature to a framework that brings both together under the single, novel rubric of 'community payback'. Similarly, while policy has much to say about what the CPO is intended to be, what it actually means in practical terms for thousands of offender clients every year, as well as social workers and beneficiaries involved in the process, is still poorly understood. Such a gap in our understanding of the Scottish criminal justice system, in itself, ought to be addressed - not only in the academic spirit of generating new knowledge, but shedding light on positive or negative practices in the CPO, or advantages and obstacles in its approaches. Indeed, such an understanding may have a wider relevancy beyond the boundaries of the CPO itself - the Scottish Prison Service's latest Organisational Review [2013] has espoused numerous values and policy aspirations that parallel, if not outright resemble, those found in the CPO. Both demonstrate a similar emphasis on officer/offender interaction as a key driver to effective change work, a desistance framework [McNeill and Weaver, 2010] (explicit, in the SPS' case, as opposed to the CPO's more implicit values) that supports client self-motivated efforts with human and social capital, and an apparent need to balance supportive intervention with the concerns of a confidence-boosting penal gloss. Therefore, an understanding of the CPO in practice - the extent to which, and if so how, its stakeholders realise these values and/or others - could hold valuable findings that might be transferred over to Scotland's other major penal institution.

This, in turn, takes us back to the second question of how this research project develops an understanding of the CPO in practice. As both the title of this thesis, and the prior discussion in this chapter, may suggest, 'interaction' is the key concept that will enable such an understanding to be developed. While a full methodological discussion of this research project will follow in a subsequent chapter, it is essential at this stage to provide a brief explanation of this project's ontological foundations. Drawing on a symbolic interactionist approach, this project is grounded in the position that human action is the process of responding to socially exchanged meanings [Denzin,

2000, p82]. When a human perceives external stimuli, they are filtered through one's perceptual process: one interprets and assigns meaning to the stimuli. Countless such perceptions integrate with one another within the human consciousness, generating additional, more complex tiers of interpretations and meanings as one produces subjective viewpoints and, ultimately, an internal 'universe' [Stake, 1995; Creswell, 2007]. It might be said, quite correctly, that 'perception' is a term that maintains a broad church with regards to its potential interpretations. This breadth, and arguable vagueness, is by design; while terms such as 'views', 'opinions', 'reactions', 'feelings', 'outlooks' or 'responses' might also be applicable, it is the counter-argument of this project that these alternative terms are limited facets of this wider concept. To use a more narrowed, prescriptive list of fixed terms would be to deny the openness and human-facing quality that is the chief advantage of this ontological position and, as will be seen in subsequent chapters, would profoundly limit the design and methodological potential of the project.

This ontology becomes particularly interesting (and valuable for this research project) when one looks at human action and interaction. Human action is driven by the actor's internal universe - how they perceive the stimuli of the given situation, intermixed with any other interpretations or meanings they consider relevant - but it also serves as another piece of external stimuli for every other individual capable of perceiving that action [Rock, 2001]. Those subsequent individuals then go through the same meaning-generative process discussed in the previous paragraph, which in turn influences their reaction. Thus interaction occurs, with individuals engaged in a cyclical process of assigning meaning to stimuli from others, creating their own stimuli based upon those meanings for others to do likewise.

Yet the situation is more complex still, for human communication is based around the imperative of shared meaning – interaction is symbolic because the communication that takes place is an effort by one actor to signify a particular meaning in such a way as to create shared understanding

between them and others perceiving them [Hewitt, 2003]. For a simple example, if one were to shout 'there's a fire' in a crowded office, that would represent an effort to create a shared understanding of what one means by that action: there is not merely a fire in the office, but that it represents a danger to those present, necessitating some form of response. To borrow the adage 'one man's trash is another man's treasure', if one were to express the opinion that a certain object was either trash or treasure, that too is an effort to create a shared understanding of one's viewpoint. Others who perceive it might not agree with the opinion expressed, and attribute numerous additional meanings to the expression in the form of judgements upon the speaker's opinion, but that does not detract from the fundamental effort to make said others understand oneself. Thus, it might be summed up, when individuals communicatively interact with one another, they do not just act based upon their underlying meanings, but with a desire for those meanings to be understood by others.

Tying this ontological discussion back into this research project's focus on the CPO in practice, there is a clear link between the interactions of CPO stakeholders and its day-to-day practical operations. How the three stakeholders (social work officers, offender clients and unpaid work beneficiaries) perceive CPO stimuli - that is to say, the actions, expressions and contextual circumstances of themselves and other stakeholders - and the interactions that arise as a result of those perceptions ultimately produce what might be referred to as a 'social reality' for the CPO. By observing and analysing the interactions between offender clients and social work officers in the supervision requirement, and between offender clients and unpaid work beneficiaries in the unpaid work requirement (selected as the two most common, conceptually predominant, and researchable requirements), this research project will be able to develop an understanding of how the CPO is constituted in practice. From the verbal discussions by which supervisors encourage their clients to undertake change work, to the symbolic significance of clients' unpaid work projects, it is these interactions that come

to define what the CPO is to those involved in realising it, as well as its ongoing consequences. These interactions may produce a number of potential social realities: one stakeholder imposing their meaning upon the other, both holding opposed meanings, one or both failing to achieve an understanding of the other's meanings, or both reaching some shared meaning about a particular stimulus.

As an ontological framework, this approach strikes a workable balance between participant insight, meaningful analysis and research feasibility. Although the entirety of a participant's internal, perceptual universe is beyond a researcher's ability to understand, that is ultimately not what is of interest to this project: rather, those perceptions influencing and, importantly, being exhibited in their actions are the fundamental building blocks for this approach. How those actions are in turn perceived and responded to by their counterpart stakeholder, and the resultant interactive dynamics that produce social reality are all fully observable by an external researcher. Within any given situation, the stakeholders exist simultaneously in an observable continuity of the same external actions, representing their internal efforts to both express meanings to the other and interpret meanings from the other [Garfinkel, 2006, p179]. As Schwandt [2000] discusses, through the analysis of intersubjective interaction - the interpretation of one another's meaningful actions - we can come to develop an understanding of the 'everyday, intersubjective world' constituted by those interactions - in this regard, the CPO is no exception as a phenomenon so constituted.

Thus the purpose of this research is, firstly, to explore the internal, subjective meanings that each stakeholder attributes to CPO-relevant stimuli - that is to say, the actions, expressions and contextual circumstances of stakeholders - and which motivate their resultant actions and expressions. Its second, subsequent purpose is to use this understanding to analyse the interactions between stakeholders, and the social realities produced by the resultant intermingling of their meanings. By developing and analysing an understanding of the social realities that shape the CPO in practice, this

research project not only seeks to generate valuable insight into the overlooked frontline operations of the CPO, but also to examine the extent to which it reflects the envisaged realities of its policy context, and how its social realities contribute to wider theories and research findings on community penalties. More so even than this, however, the project aspires to demonstrate the valuable findings, analyses and contributions that can be derived from such an interactionist perspective.

As a result, this project takes the form of two frontline, observational case studies: the first, a six-month shadowing of two social workers as they engage with their CPO caseloads (between 5-7 client offenders each at any given time); the second, a four-month rotating attachment to three unpaid work teams (4-6 client offenders each). The cases study design, combined with embedded observation, allowed for an ideal opportunity to explore the CPO in a grounded, holistic, and participant-driven manner. Daily research activities included not only observation of stakeholder interactions, but informal interview engagement with research participants to better understand their perceptions and perspectives on the CPO, which in turn helped to guide and nuance my own observational findings.

These findings reveal a practical, frontline reality to the CPO that was markedly distinct from that envisioned in its policy. As opposed to 'paying back by working at change', supervision focussed on engaging offender clients in an individualised, supportive relationship that sought to address ongoing criminogenic issues and realise clients' own aspirations. Unconcerned with ideas of reparation, and treating public protection as a consequent benefit rather than an overriding goal, supervision epitomised both the strengths and weaknesses of a one-on-one working alliance: a process that put offender clients' perspective at its centre, but which struggled to address the wider environmental challenges they faced.

Unpaid work was likewise distinct from its policy presentation, not least of all because its 'beneficiaries' were not members of the public - who remained nigh-universally unaware of the work being conducted right next to

them - but rather the organisations and staff with/for whom offender clients worked. The very nature of that work, and the engagement of these beneficiaries, had a profound effect on the potential experiences of unpaid work: for some, an automated, mechanical input of labour to complete menial odd-jobs; for others, an engaged, meaningful contribution that helped to build a nascent, new, positive self-identity. Unfortunately, however, good intentions in the form of normalising offender client presence on-site, and a lack of awareness as to how beneficiaries could in turn benefit said clients, limited the long-term potential of unpaid work.

As a result, this thesis argues that both the themes of 'community' and 'payback' are considerably more complex than their presentation in policy. In the absence of a clear geographic/societal stake in either requirement, 'community' was understood in the CPO's practical context as something closer to desistance's notion of 'social capital' [McNeill and Weaver, 2010]. Unfortunately, the development of such opportunities to entrench clients' move away from offending was limited in both requirements, leaving offender clients frequently engaged and motivated in an effort to desist from crime, but lacking the means to push back against the criminogenic inertia and influence found in their environments. This, in turn, emphasises the thesis' follow-on argument: that 'community', far from being understood as either a policy-envisioned beneficiary or a reintegrative stakeholder, was consistently encountered as an contextual obstacle to positive progress, and an ongoing criminogenic influence in clients' lives.

'Payback', meanwhile, held little relevancy in practical, day-to-day terms. In supervision, social workers and offender clients perceived and constructed their efforts at facilitating the latter's change work as an act of individual support: helping a human being achieve their aspirations and overcome the obstacles thereto, rather than rehabilitate an offender (and in so doing, provide reparation to the public). Similarly, the absence of a penal element to unpaid work resulted in offender clients' efforts being perceived, by both them and the beneficiaries, as positive, novel acts of contribution.

While this helped to build positive client self-perception, the fiction upon which their on-site presence was normalised limited the requirement's (and beneficiaries') capacity to provide meaningful, long-term support.

These findings have interesting implications when considered amidst the wider literature of theory and research. While theories that advocate for probation as a secondary, supportive service to facilitate client desistance are supported, this research not only emphasises the importance of a client's existing social bonds for the purpose of positive self-identity and motivation development, but also the need for wider networks to practically realise long-term change through employment and environmental improvement. These findings go beyond more formalised, standardised theories of client support such as the Good Lives Model, harnessing similar narratives of asset-use but in a far more client-centric (and client-controlled) manner, whilst for better and arguably worse rejecting more offending-centric approaches that limit both the moral dangers of a retributive stance but also the potential benefits of a redemption-based moral narrative.

Unpaid work, on the other hand, suggests several radical reconceptualisations of community sentencing. Theories emphasising the centrality and reintegrative potential of a public response to the symbolism and engagement of unpaid work are challenged by findings that indicate the requirement's potential to improve clients' self-perceptions and create their own network of mutual support. Indeed, the findings of this research suggest an inversion, with the public unconsciously acting as a symbolic performer to clients, with a narrative less evocative of reparation and instead a sense of generative contribution. On the other hand, the lack of beneficiary response to clients indicates the need for greater client-demonstrated symbolism and engagement, suggesting the need for a carefully controlled penal element as a means to activate a sense of redemptive, reciprocal support which beneficiaries are well-placed to provide.

In terms of comparing this research to prior academic works, perhaps one of the most important theoretical influences is that of Duff's theory [2003a

and b] of morally communicative punishment. It is important to stress that this research is not based upon any presumption that the CPO engages offenders on a moral level, expressing their offending as a wrongdoing whilst offering offenders an opportunity to make a symbolic apology and demonstration of change. That is but one potential model of interaction amongst numerous others. The deeper, more influential value of Duff's theory lies in its recognition of the transformative potential of stakeholder perception - especially that of the offender - and the ability of particular interactions to define the nature of what a penal sanction is in practice (that is to say, its social reality).

A more proximate point of comparison would be Anderson et al.'s evaluation [2015] of CPOs, although it may be better said that this is a point of contrast. Although this research and that evaluation both focus upon the CPO's practical operations through a case study approach, this research is explorative as opposed to evaluative. While the value of both an evaluative approach, and Anderson et al.'s research as such, is fully recognised, it is by its very nature predetermined and presupposed by what it seeks to evaluate. As opposed to this research's explorative approach, which seeks to limit prior assumptions about the field in order to remain sensitive to novelty and participant perspectives, this evaluative perspective approached its field with a pre-existing 'logic model'. Its findings were thus filtered into determining the extent of this model which, while once again valuable in its own right, is not fit for the purposes of this research.

A similar point of comparison is drawn between this research and Day, Ward and Shirley's research [2011] into reintegration services for long-term dangerous offenders. While this research shares their central design argument that, when 'relatively little is known about a phenomenon' [p70], the case study is best suited for discovering unique characteristics, this research also acknowledges Day, Ward and Shirley's own scepticism regarding 'best practice' auditing tools.

One of the inescapable facets of research based on such an

ontological foundation is the role of the researcher's own perspective. Being as human as any of this research project's participants, I too perceive and interpret external stimuli to give them meaning. The ontological framework discussed above indicates that it is still possible for me, as a researcher, to develop an understanding, through the actions and interactions of stakeholders, of both the perceptions that motivate such actions and the social realities produced by such. Rather, what is at issue is a particular form of my own interpretation of these perceptions, actions and realities - namely, my critique thereof. Such a critique of research findings is not grounded in statistical or actuarial determinations of 'what works' as measured against some pragmatic criteria of effectiveness [cf. Day, Ward and Shirley, 2011, and their own recognition of the CPAI-2000's limited applicability in practice], but an openly acknowledged value judgement. By drawing upon the locus of this research project - the personal reactions and practical consequences of participants' perceptions, (inter)actions and realities - as well as the wider resources of prior criminological research and theory, it is the aim of this project to provide not only a simple reportage of the CPO, but an informed, humanistic discussion of what findings should be considered successful or unsuccessful, good or bad practice, admirable or problematic, valuable or challenging. This is, arguably, the importance of the researcher in such a project: not only an external observer capable of developing an understanding of the stakeholders and their intersubjective realities, but bridging the particular research field and the wider context of theory and research to make an evidenced argument as to an evaluation of one's findings.

In terms of research upon which my own builds, Armstrong and Weaver's research into the experiences and user views of punishment in Scotland [2010, and Weaver and Armstrong, 2011, respectively] provide an important foundation. Their emphasis on developing an understanding of lesser-understood aspect of the penal system (short prison and community-based sentences), and the centrality of offenders' own experiences and

perspective thereof, are both important facets that this research mirrors in turn. Such facets synergise with the aforementioned concepts underpinning Duff's theory, setting out a clear methodological proposition that, if one is to explore an under-researched sanction such as the CPO, an understanding of offender experiences therein is crucial. Similarly, the findings of both research projects also act as valuable evidence in support of an interactive approach, given the importance that interaction with both social workers and 'the community' had upon offenders' experiences (from the social worker as a trusted figure of support, to the sense of positive contribution in paying back to ordinary citizens). Where my research is distinct is in its methodological approach: utilising retrospective, personal accounts from offenders as a supplement to the primary methodology of observing these interactions first-hand.

Although, given the timing of its publication, not an initial influence on this research, Kirkwood's argument [2016] in favour of utilising qualitative analysis for practitioner/user interactions to better understand interventions and the process of desistance has obvious and important parallels with this project. While this research differs in its focus on how interaction produces external social realities between stakeholders, rather than internal self-narratives/identities (although such aspects will prove an important part of this research's findings), Kirkwood's argument in favour of exploring interactions and their consequences in situ, as opposed to through decontextualised, retrospective interview accounts (themselves potentially distorted by the nature of interview questions), is highly relevant. Where this research primarily deviates is in its use of what might be referred to as a 'broad church' approach to discourse analysis: while discussed in depth later, it combines both the use of specific reality-constructing language with the more interactional aspects of turn-taking, response-management and relevancy that Kirkwood ascribes to conversation analysis, albeit with a wider 'turn-based' scope rather than the minutia-focussed 'fine-grained approach' he describes it as involving [p225].

Last, but certainly not least, no observational study of community sentencing could be made without reference to and comparison with McIvor's work [1992] on evaluating the Scottish Community Service Order (CSO). McIvor's research is an extensive compilation of studies with methodologies ranging from questionnaires, statistical analysis and qualitative interviews, and examines the CSO across a range of important factors: the characteristics of those sentenced to CSOs, effective practice, and offender client experience. In this regard, this particular research project cleaves closest to the lattermost of these factors, expanding beyond a largely post-hoc attitudinal/impact perspective into the interactionist ontology discussed above. This distinction, and the contemporary fact that this research examines both unpaid work and supervision as dual facets of the CPO's identity, means that this research cannot hope to match McIvor's own work in an end-to-end evaluation of community sentencing, but instead hopes to provide a richer, more in-depth understanding of how stakeholder interactions constitute the CSO's contemporary counterpart in day-to-day practice.

Chapter 2 - Envisaged Social Realities of CPO Policy

Although the focus of this research is to develop an in-depth, explorative understanding of the social realities of the CPO as realised through the interactions of its stakeholders, it is nevertheless essential to begin by examining the wider Scottish (Government) policy context within which such practice is located. While the actual extent of such policy's influence upon frontline participants is fluid, the assumptions and assertions present therein will provide a valuable point of comparison against which to better understand their social realities in practice. The extent to which participants' interactions, and subsequent social realities, evoke or defy envisaged policy inputs and outcomes will form a vital part of the final discussion of this research's findings. The purpose is not to test policy as hypothesis, but rather to use such a comparison as a means of better understanding the CPO in action, as well as a metric by which the contribution of findings can be measured.

As with the rest of this research, one of the chief concerns in approaching this analytical effort has been that of avoiding undue presumptions colouring relevant materials. While it is easier to assert, and support with evidence, a particular reading of policy, too radical or specific an interpretation risks undermining the entire purpose of this chapter's effort - that is, to develop an understanding of the potential social realities envisaged by CPO policy. To minimise the danger of deviating too drastically in this interpretation of CPO policy, this chapter will examine said policy through the lenses of two conceptual themes that the CPO itself lays down as integral to its own understanding: community and payback.

Community

From the outset of the CPO's description, 'community' is positioned both centrally and focally with regards to its envisaged social reality.

'Community' - here meaning both specific geographical districts as well as the wider law-abiding collective of 'society' - is the supposed beneficiary of payback [Scottish Government, 2010a]. The community is either the recipient of direct reparative action, or indirectly benefits from the offender's rehabilitation due to improved safety. When examined in terms of the interaction that is supposed to produce this social reality, however, it appears on first instance that 'community' is a markedly passive concept: the offender makes reparation and/or 'change[s] their offending behaviours', but the community is not required to undertake any reciprocal or complimentary action. With the exception of the implicit ability to express a lack of confidence in the CPO, presumably to external third parties, and receive consultation regarding local unpaid work activities, the dynamic of the CPO would appear to be that the offender labours, and the community benefits. That is not to say that the offender does not potentially reap some benefits from the CPO - while it is envisaged as a 'punishment', the theme of community is not invoked at the offender's expense in a zero-sum rivalry, and thus it can double as a 'supportive intervention' [Scottish Government, 2010a] - but nevertheless there is a marked discrepancy in the interaction between the two stakeholders.

The CPO's National Outcomes and Standards [2010b] suggest there may be a more symbolically dynamic interaction between offender and community, wherein offenders can not only demonstrate their capacity for change to the community as a symbolic audience, but improve their relationships with local groups - the precise mechanics of this interaction, and the consequent reality it achieves are, however, unspecified. It might be surmised that, if local groups regard the CPO with confidence, credibility and support, then such positive perceptions will extend to offenders who carry out CPOs also (but again, the end result is left unstated). Certainly, recent community justice strategy [Scottish Government, 2016] has highlighted the importance of not only local agencies and services to support offender reintegration, but also local communities in promoting desistance and social

inclusion. From an alternative perspective, the theme of 'community' may serve as a symbolic audience for the offender: the McLeish Report [Scottish Prisons Commission, 2008, p33] discusses the possibility of community penalties serving as a means of offenders confronting their wrong doing and performing an act of apology - placing the 'community' as the target object of that apology, and presumably further supporting the development of ongoing, supportive relationships already mentioned.

However, this envisaged social reality is challenged by one key issue: awareness. For example, in Anderson et al.'s evaluation of CPOs [2015], conducted on behalf of Scottish Government Social Research, it was acknowledged that while unpaid work was being carried out 'in community settings' (i.e. a geographic locality), the extent to which members of the public were aware of such work was unclear. The labelling and publication of unpaid work was found to be inconsistent, and reliant on host organisations and their local managers to inform the public. While on the more basic level, this does not necessarily undermine the theme of 'community' as beneficiaries - both society and local groups still reap the rewards of unpaid work and rehabilitation regardless - any more advanced, interactive understand of the community as a stakeholder with whom offenders can develop a relationship would seem to be rendered impossible. Furthermore, as noted by early local authority reports on CPOs [Scottish Government, 2012], even instances of passive communities benefited from public awareness of unpaid work, as a positive feedback of increasing profile gave rise to public suggestions for larger and more significant projects. Such reports also provide an exhaustive list of means by which local authorities disseminated information to raise said profile of unpaid work, as well as communicating its benefits as a positive framing for public perception: open days, presentations to community groups, 'before and after' displays, articles in local websites and newspapers, commemorative plaques and more [Scottish Government, 2012, p10]. What may be read as implicit in these efforts, especially in the desire to frame unpaid work as beneficial, is an

unspoken concern in CPO policy that the default public perception of unpaid work will be a negative one (this is certainly reflected in 'Reforming and Revitalising' with the concerns related to perceptions of community penalties as not 'hard' enough [Scottish Government, 2007]). Even recent community justice strategy recognises the need to reduce stigma in promoting reintegration [Scottish Government, 2016, p12]. A reluctance to have negative public responses mar any interactions with offenders, and thus tarnish the resultant social reality, may be an explanation as to why unpaid work activities are conducted covertly, or with an eye towards positive presentation.

There is, of course, the consequent risk that the relationship between 'community' and offender becomes reconceptualised (or at least re-emphasised) in a more zero-sum manner. The implicit link between punishment/'robustness' and public confidence in discussion of the CPO [Scottish Government, 2010a] is on its own concerning; but given the concern with demonstrable 'toughness' in prior community penalty policy [Scottish Government, 2007], there is the danger that 'community' may be invoked by the CPO as a justification to produce a social reality where the harsh treatment of the offender serves as a demonstrable currency to buy public support.

Somewhat in contrast to the above, it may also be said that 'community' serves as an aspirational concept for offenders: in their interactions with their responsible officer, offenders who make 'highly positive progress' may receive early discharge [Scottish Government, 2010a, p10]. This has an implicit but clear connection to the concept of the offender changing 'their offending behaviours', and reinforces the community as a law-abiding collective, and towards which the offender works to (re)achieve membership. The suggestion is that the interaction between offender and responsible officer is to prepare and support the former in order to integrate into the law-abiding majority, and the best-case social outcome is one in which the offender makes significant, measurable steps to become a part of

this community. The responsible officer is positioned in their interactions with offenders not only as a means of ensuring offender compliance, but to pursue 'desistance from offending behaviour'. More than a concept, 'community' serves as a state of social reality, with its membership defined by the offender's move towards long-term desistance. This is certainly supported by earlier policy visions of community penalties, which indicate that community is more than a locative descriptor in relation to offenders:

"REHABILITATION AND REINTEGRATION - With the exception of a small number of very serious crimes, "offenders" will return to (or remain in) a community. Where possible, penalties should do what they can to help people tackle underlying problems that contribute towards their offending and help them to move back towards a law-abiding lifestyle." [Scottish Government, 2007, p3]

In the CPO's National Outcomes and Standards [2010b, p28], this linkage is reiterated as a process of voluntary, motivated offender learning 'as a means to community reintegration'.

Similarly, it has been noted in Anderson et al.'s evaluation of CPOs [2015] that the notion of 'community' can have a profound influence on offenders' perceptions of unpaid work, and as a result transform the social reality produced by their interaction with beneficiaries. Where unpaid work is linked with vulnerable or in-need groups (for instance, elderly beneficiaries), then unpaid work becomes perceived as a positive, contributive activity ('good work') and offenders can come to feel they are 'doing something with themselves'. This would potentially compliment the more passive concept of community discussed previously, as it places a greater emphasis on the symbolism of community beneficiaries. Their role is to represent a worthy cause which, in addressing through unpaid work, elevates the offender's perceptions of both said work and themselves as the workers.

By contrast, however, there is an indication that, far from aspirational

membership, 'community' as a theme in offender/officer interactions may represent a challenge with regard to 'underlying problems' [Scottish Government, 2007, p16]. Community, in this light, can be understood as the contextual criminogenic influences that contribute to offending, and complicate any subsequent efforts at desistance. However, in terms of the social reality envisaged to address this challenge, the role of the officer appears to be that of a referee, signposting offenders towards mainstream services such as health, housing and skills development to receive the necessary support. This difficulty can be traced all the way back to the McLeish Report, in which the recognition was made that 'the social and cultural causes of reoffending makes it unwise to overstate the role that the penal system can play in reducing reoffending' [Scottish Prisons Commission, 2008, p41]. The report acknowledges the 'serious and chronic disadvantage and exclusion' offenders face, the links between disadvantage/exclusion and their local community, both in the sense of their geographic location and their network of relationships, and its criminogenic effects. In terms of the envisaged social reality for community penalties, however, this understanding of community recognises the limitations of penal sentences in addressing such widespread and deeply entrenched issues; this is not, however, to justify a narrowed, defeatist perspective, but to emphasise the need for a joined-up, nationwide social strategy to support penalties in addressing these community challenges.

Certainly, in recent years, this recognition of the community as a site of criminogenic inequality and deprivation has come to serve as a cornerstone of wider policy [Scottish Government, 2017b]. As indicated in the previous paragraph, the response is one that recognises the need for a collective, cohesive social strategy in addressing societal inequalities, but the acceptance of communities as geographic sites of poverty, victimisation and offending is nevertheless significant in terms of the CPO's social realities. Far from a notion of communities being paid back to by reparation or rehabilitation, it recognises communities as sites of challenge and obstacle;

the CPO now finds itself within a wider context, with a new national strategy for community justice [Scottish Government, 2016] that envisages tackling the underlying causes of offending, along with providing management and support for offender community reintegration. Indeed, far from treating criminogenic communities as a passive, inert challenge, this national strategy advocates for engagement with and involvement of local residents to identify and coproduce solutions, and the CPO has a significant role to play. Not only can victims of crime feedback on reparative projects, but both supervision and unpaid work can serve to simultaneously reintegrate individuals whilst building collective commitment.

Drawing on prior policy, however, there is also the potential for a particular form of community to serve in a more involved, interactive function: the preservation or production of social 'links' with the offender to form a personal network that develops and supports their membership of a law-abiding collective [Scottish Government, 2007]. Certainly the CPO's National Outcomes and Standards [2010b] indicate a focus on supporting offender desistance through the development of interpersonal skills and social capital. Anderson et al.'s evaluation of CPOs [2015], for example, draws on offender accounts to discuss interpersonal connections between offenders and organisational beneficiaries, wherein the social connection elevates the unpaid work into an opportunity to develop new skill sets, as well as ongoing support in making best use of them. Although far from a local neighbourhood coming together to support an offender, such accounts nevertheless demonstrate the potential for such interpersonal associations to fundamentally shift the nature of unpaid work's social reality from unilateral reparation to a desistance-fostering exchange.

Payback

The core theme of 'payback' in the CPO is realised in two distinct forms: directly reparative effort on the part of the offender (typically through

unpaid work), and the offender's personal efforts at addressing their offending behaviour, which provides payback in the form of societal integration and improved social safety [Scottish Government, 2010a, p1]. In this sense, there is a clear comparison to be initially drawn between 'payback' and 'community': both appear to be based upon a unilateral interaction between offender and the beneficiary of their payback, wherein the offender is placed as an active participant of the effort (whether unpaid work or change work) while the beneficiary exists as a passive recipient. This would suggest a hierarchical social reality brought about by unpaid work, wherein the offender is burdened with the onus of payback - of undoing their wrongdoing through some form of effort - while the beneficiary's role is merely to receive payment. Thus, for instance, Anderson et al.'s evaluation of CPOs [2015] discusses the idea of payback, especially unpaid work, as being 'in and for' the local community, demonstrating not only the locative nature of payback but also a linear relationship between its stakeholders.

The idea of 'paying back by working at change' does, however, complicate this social reality: its reference to the idea of 'providing opportunities for [offenders'] reintegration' [Scottish Government, 2010a, p1] does suggest some form of reciprocal dynamic between offender and beneficiary; once the offender has made good upon their effort to repair and/or change, that must be met by the beneficiary with, at least, a wiping of the offender's metaphorical slate, and perhaps even more so a concerted effort to support the offender in maintaining their behavioural change. Whether this is through the medium of a social work supervisor, or expected to be realised by local residents engaged through the CPO, is a crucial detail but one that policy leaves unspecified. Certainly, the supervisor is given significant responsibility and power in this regard - able to apply to court for a variation or early discharge of the CPO if an offender makes positive progress in their desistance from offending behaviour - but this alone does not achieve the reciprocation implicit within the idea of reintegrative opportunities. At best, it folds the achievement of said opportunities into the

offender's own 'progress' and onus of effort, rather than looking towards beneficiaries and/or local residents as the holders of such a duty. By contrast, the CPO's National Outcomes and Standards [Scottish Government, 2010b] discusses the potential for reparative activities to directly improve offenders' relationships with local communities. However, in discussing the typical nature of unpaid work placements studied by Anderson et al.'s evaluation of CPOs [2015] - decorating, cleaning, environmental work, construction and workshop production - there is no explicit mention of developing relationships through this 'payback'. The evaluation acknowledges that the unpaid work is 'being carried out in community settings' [p73] - defined as in local areas and/or with local groups and charities - but while this is used as grounds to attest that payback is being achieved, the recognised lack of awareness on the part of local community residents suggests a simpler, more unilateral form of payback.

On the one hand, it may be said that payback is in the eye of the debtor, and that so long as the unilateral relationship discussed above exists then the offender has indeed paid back. Such logic would, by extension, place greater emphasis on the offender undoing their past wrongdoing; but without public awareness, the socially redemptive repercussions of that undoing (the vital linkage with the idea of 'payback by working at change') cannot be achieved. Returning to Anderson et al.'s evaluation of CPOs [2015], the accounts provided by interviewed offenders regarding their unpaid work would seem to reflect this, focussing more on the positive impact upon their own perception that unpaid work had provided a benefit to the community, rather than their contact with them [p112]. This would seem to indicate that unpaid work may have an affective social reality, wherein the provision of positive, helpful work to beneficiaries supports an alteration in offenders' self-perception; in this regard, direct interaction with members of the public may not be necessary, as the focus is not on developing a relationship so much as it is on the transformative significance that rendering work to them can achieve.

One of the key tensions within the theme of 'payback' is that between the idea of the CPO as a 'punishment' and a 'supportive intervention' [Scottish Government, 2010a]. Policy rightly recognises that the two concepts are not inimical - that within a punitive context offenders can still receive support in changing their lives -but that does not mean the two concepts are not conflicting. Punishment evokes ideas of 'tough' treatment [Scottish Government, 2007; Anderson et al., 2015] - of utilising 'payback' as a means of creating a social reality where both offenders and (potentially especially) the public understand the rigours and undesirability of the CPO. Even setting aside the vengefulness of, by contrast, the Casey Report [2008] - where the envisaged social reality was more a matter of the public getting 'payback' on the offender, than the offender rendering 'payback' - the penal framework of imposing payback as a response to wrongdoing (reparative for harm inflicted) risks ostracising the offender as an object, rather than an agent. The implicit social reality is one of debt and obligation to achieve 'payback', rather than progress and change. To quote the CPO's National Outcomes and Standards, 'reparation enables offenders to 'pay back' for the harm that they have caused and to demonstrate that they are capable of change' [2010b, p69] - a reality supported by the policy stance of endeavouring to place unpaid work schemes in communities that suffered from offenders' wrongdoing.

Although the distinction may be subtle, a contrast should nevertheless be considered with the McLeish Report's vision of payback [Scottish Prisons Commission, 2008]: possessed of a penal element through the classic 'fine on time', but where 'payback' was conceived more 'positively' as a catalyst for offender self-realisation, apology, compensation and ultimate redemption. The difference is one of agency, and the two social realities presented are markedly divergent: one in which 'payback' is rendered because it is required of the offender as punishment, and one in which it is rendered because it is desired by the offender as part of a pervasive effort at supporting change.

This, in turn, ties into the idea of 'payback' as 'constructive' [Scottish

Prisons Commission, 2008]: a focus less on the offender's wrongdoing, and instead on the chance to 'make good' to the victims and/or community. The problematic linkage between offender rehabilitation and payback is still present, but at least this exists within a wider framework that emphasises a prospective goal of mutual benefit, rather than a retrospective stance of penal mandate. Although the McLeish Report's language of 'confronting and challenging offenders' may seem incongruously aggressive, the central stance presented is nevertheless one that places the offender at the core of the change work: both the focal point of various criminogenic challenges, but also the key stakeholder in addressing and overcoming those challenges (in concern with wider societal resources and social support). Based on the CPO's National Outcomes and Standards, the case management approach upon which supervision operates would seem to reflect this stance:

"A professional task that involves engaging an individual in the process of change, through supervision and monitoring progress, delivering and/or brokering the necessary interventions to support that change, and prompting engagement and compliance." [Scottish Government, 2010b, p25]

This is, in turn, supported by the more contemporary national strategy for community justice [Scottish Government, 2016], which emphasises a person-centred approach based on a recognition that desistance requires an individualised, responsive approach to offenders achieved, in significant part, through an effective relationship with their officer (and, where possible, an offender's wider network of support).

Building on this approach, there is also guidance for CPO supervisors to explicitly support offender reintegration, address criminogenic needs and support the payback process [Scottish Government, 2010b]; not only does the guidance highlight the importance of individualising this support based on the specific needs of the offender in question, but the separation of these

three tasks is significant for the envisaged social reality of unpaid work. Reintegration, for instance, is not presumed to be an automatic result of payback, whether by working at change or through unpaid work, but rather the product of concerted effort at promoting 'social inclusion' through multi-agency partnership, ranging from employment to health and housing. And overarching the entire effort is the recognised priority of the offender's own motivation and engagement in the process, emphasising the criticality of a willing, involved participant over a merely compliant object. Indeed, in focussing on the individual learning of offenders and their 'Behavioural Contract' - a mutual agreement with their supervising officer as to a package of individualised interventions - the notion of punishment is explicitly avoided in favour of reintegration.

CPO Policy Context

From even this brief discussion of Scottish Government policy, it has become clear that the CPO promises to be considerably more complex than its core propositions would suggest. When one looks beyond the proposed vision of the CPO itself, and incorporates wider policy both preceding and following the sentence's implementation, both 'community' and 'payback' become considerably more multi-faceted and challenging concepts. Some are variations on a similar theme, while others seem to exist in stark contrast (and, indeed, conflict) with certain assertions as to the CPO. The purpose of this chapter was to contextualise this research project, not to justify it, but nevertheless this degree of complexity in policy highlights the need to investigate the frontline operations of the CPO, in order to see how it is constituted in practice (and, equally important, how practice compares to this tapestry of policy).

Chapter 3 - Literature Review

Approaching a phenomenon such as the CPO with the intent to explore it as novel territory presents a particular challenge. As will be discussed in the next chapter, the design of this research emphasises a holistic examination of stakeholder interactions, examining subtleties and nuances of behaviour and communication in order to develop an understanding of how their perceptions intermingle.

The challenge comes in reviewing literature pertinent to the CPO. Not only is there the question of what literature is pertinent to this under-researched phenomenon, but the content - indeed, the very construction - of such a review can risk predetermining the research perspective, carrying in assumptions or skewing findings, which ultimately undermine the integrity of the observations. The priority of this research is to understand the participants and the social realities they create and occupy in as close to their own terms as possible, and in so doing it is essential to position the literature in such a way as to minimise its lensing effect.

Taking inspiration from how this research approaches CPO policy, the literature has likewise been positioned primarily as a point of comparison. Research questions have been derived from the literature not as theoretically-coloured assumptions into the nature of the CPO prior to its exploration, or presumed links between the CPO and prior research. Rather, the questions have been divided into the same three topics as the literature: the rationales of stakeholder interactions (why they (inter)act the way they do); the processes of their interactions (how they interact with each other); and the significances of their (inter)actions (what their (inter)actions mean).

Thus literature has been drawn from the twin, broad fields of probation and community sentence theory/research based upon its content pertaining to stakeholder interactions. Such content has then been analysed to develop a set of dynamic spectra of possible stakeholder interactions and subsequent social realities. The project's ontological framework of interactionism

therefore provided the stable, structured framework that guided observation, while the literature existed as a range of possible comparisons for the subsequent findings. No single theory or research is presumed, as a result, to be applicable to the CPO; rather, the findings determine what aspects of the literature context are relevant, either as points of comparison or contrast, similarity or difference, application or problem. This not only ensured said findings were made relevant by reference to existing points of theory or prior research, but indeed allowed for a symbiotic, bilateral dynamic to emerge. Findings were understood on participants' terms, but were then also able to be enhanced with reference to literature, or enhance the literature itself by advancing existing theories/research.

As a final note, it is worth clarifying that in the subsequent review the more generic terms 'officer', 'offender' and 'beneficiary' are used to reflect the typical terminology found in most theories and research. Within the main body of this project's research findings chapters, however, these terms are interchanged for, respectively, 'supervisor', 'client' and 'beneficiary'.

Officer-Offender – The Many Forms of Probation Relationships

Rationale

What is the purpose of the probation relationship? What rationale underlies the interaction between an officer and the offender in their charge – why do they communicate with one another? Traditional probation provided an answer in its core framework ethos of 'advise, assist and befriend' [Harrison, 2006], but even this stance requires further analysis to fully interpret its purpose.

Annison, Eadie and Knight's research posits the argument that there has been 'a shift away from client-centred practice towards a more technicist and prescribed approach to tasks' [2008, p259]; based upon the literature that follows, the two points of this argument can be expanded into a fundamental spectrum of rationales underlying the probation relationship. On the one hand, there is the rationale that seeks to achieve normative

engagement, using the relationship to facilitate the offender's internal change (e.g. the ideal relationship type discussed by probation officers in Annison et al.'s research [see also King, 1958; Durnescu, 2012]); on the other hand, the rationale that builds the relationship around interventions intended to provide pragmatically-grounded external assistance to the offender (in Annison et al.'s research, this is positioned, and to a certain extent written off, as risk assessment, but there are other potential interventions discussed below that may be worthy of greater credit).

Let us address the former rationale first – that of normative engagement. Returning to the probation tradition of 'advise, assist and befriend', there is an obvious parallel here: the central goal of the officer and offender interacting is to effect a deep and meaningful change in the offender's behaviour through engagement with their underlying attitudes and beliefs [Burnett, Baker and Roberts, 2007]. On the one hand, this particular set of meanings suggests the officer as seeking to engage the offender and provide guidance and support (advice/help) in an effort to guide them towards that change, but this requires the offender to 'buy in' to the interaction [Lewis, 2014], contributing not only their basic compliance but a sincere motivation to change, and willingness to both work with the aforementioned guidance and contribute to the interaction (e.g. expression of problems, needs, etc.) [Weaver and Armstrong, 2011].

On the surface, this rationale does suggest an ideal form of interaction for officers and offenders, but it is not without its dangers. There is the risk, for instance, that this stance encourages the offender to be treated as a normative object: someone to be helped, 'respected' and transformed, but not necessarily given meaningful agency in any ability to engage with the relationship and determine its direction. While their willingness is still required to achieve the desired change, there is no official space for them to bring anything else to the interaction in order to influence the parameters of that change. McNeill [2009a] draws attention to this in his distinction between medical-somatic and social psychological rehabilitation: the former places the

offender as a passive recipient of the interaction process, upon whom forces (criminogenic or rehabilitative) operate; the latter recognises the opportunity that the offender's agency represents, in their own ability to engage not only with their own underlying issues, but in the interventative process by which those issues are addressed. Consider, for an example of the medical-somatic model, the standard practice of the Good Lives Model [Ward and Brown, 2004]. This approach to officer-offender interaction seeks to involve the offender's pre-existing positive norms, values and aspirations (i.e. positive perceptions and meanings they bring into the interaction) to both facilitate their motivation and guide the change process by providing them the competencies and opportunities to achieve these positive goals [Ward, 2010; Day, Ward and Shirley, 2011]. However, taking Ward's discussion [2010] of the model as an example, the heavy emphasis on practitioner determination of offenders' aspirations, assets and challenges presents an uncomfortable implication that the offender lacks any meaningful opportunity to contribute their own perspective to a discussion of their own selves.

An alternative conceptualisation may be 'co-production': an operational stance providing opportunities for offenders to collaborate with officers in developing and tailoring their own interventions [Fox and Marsh, 2016]. In a similar vein, McCulloch's research [2005] recognises the significance to offenders (both immediate and with regards to more long-term change) that the simple act of voicing problems, being listened to and receiving guidance can have. What may first appear as token acknowledgement of the offender, when examined through the lens of offender involvement, becomes an opportunity for them to be an active contributor to the change process, provided it actually enables and facilitates more targeted (and individualised) engagement by the officer. All this suggests that while, yes, there is the potential for such a relationship rationale to favour the officer in imposing their own meanings and occupying a dominant position in interactions, there is likewise potential for a more balanced, even offender-driven, dialogic process of problem-solving and

personal development.

All that being said, however, we should not view even these more engaged relationships with an uncritical eye: Porporino and Fabiano's language [2008] in discussing case management and the facilitation of change raises concerns of officer-offender interaction being based on a rationale that uses the interaction to masquerade coercion as choice, tricking the offender into believing their transformation is internally motivated, rather than externally engineered. Conversely, Lynch [2000] warns of an offender's agency being turned against them, recasting issues of rehabilitation and engagement into those of bad attitude requiring self-responsibilisation, either removing the onus for officer assistance under the rubric of offender 'self-help' or justifying strict control measures under the guise of 'engagement'. Thus, even when the offender does have the opportunity to contribute to their interaction with the officer, the meanings the officer brings to that interaction as part of their rationale may preclude meaningful opportunities, instead forcing the offender to behave in a particular way or face sanctioning. By contrast, Robinson and McNeill [2017] also note the rise of 'new rehabilitation', which shifts the emphasis from classical welfarist and humanitarian grounds for offender engagement in a socially reintegrative enterprise, and instead focuses on 'responsibilising' offenders as a utilitarian means to a crime-reduction end. Similarly, the probation dynamic may be recalibrated as fulfilling an offender's moral obligation to 'make good' and redeem themselves from their wrongdoing [McNeill and Whyte, 2007].

It is also worthwhile mentioning that normative engagement need not be achieved in as interpersonal a manner as suggested by the literature above (and discussed at greater length in the following section on process). For instance, Duff's theory on punishment [2003a and b] suggests the very act of punishment itself may be used to address the offender's perception, both with regards to the punishment itself and their own life course, by encouraging a sense of remorse, penitence and a desire for reformation. By this understanding, the offender's interpretation of the punishment is vital for

transforming it into something more meaningful (or, rather, possessing an alternative, more positive, meaning in terms of the offender's rationale for participating). Taking this further, to a point where the interaction between officer and offender is more unilateral and altogether stricter, Foucault's theory of panoptic discipline [1979] might also present a potential non-interpersonal model of 'engagement': the offender existing in a state of supervision, under the threat of greater sanction in the event of disobedience, and this power dynamic achieves an internalisation and responsabilisation of control.

By contrast to normative engagement, pragmatic assistance, if stripped of all its (often criticised) trappings, might be summarised best as a focus on building human capital: developing skills, capacities and personal resources [McNeill, 2004], as opposed to changing the offender's outlook [Von Hirsch, 1998]. With this change in rationale comes a change in the focus of the officer and offender's interaction: Fenton [2013], for instance, envisages a mutually engaged, cooperative process of goal-setting focussed on the practical challenges of desistance faced by the offender, similar to that envisaged in Bottoms and McWilliams' theoretic paradigm [1979]. Normative engagement is less important because it is reconceptualised as supporting something that already exists as part of the offender's own meanings underlying why they might seek pragmatic assistance, rather than something in need of development; thus King characterises the interaction on this level as 'nurturing pro-social narratives' and 'believing in the would-be desister' [2013, p138 & 140] – self-motivation to continued desistance supported by an engaged relationship. However, the practical risk of such a reprioritisation towards pragmatic aspects of desistance is that it diminishes the value of the interaction between the two stakeholders, reducing their communication to the addressing of menial tasks that facilitate targeted assistance: King [2013] gives the examples of form-filling, phone-calling and letter-writing by the officer on the offender's behalf.

Furthermore, this is but one envisaged model of pragmatic assistance.

Consider, for instance, Harrison's critique of modern behavioural rehabilitative practice and its educational interaction foundations: 'teaching the offender how to recognise situations, how to solve problems and how to cope with situations similar to those where he/she would have previously offended' [2006, p148]. Interaction between the stakeholders is still geared towards pragmatic assistance, but that 'assistance' comes in the form of educating the offender in constant self-policing techniques. The consequence is a characterisation that traps the offender in a particular, imposed meaning: as someone regarding whom criminogenesis operates from within, a constellation of generic problems (criminogenic needs) that must be managed or guarded against, rather than a unique individual facing unique challenges [Fitzgibbon, 2007]. Similar to the issue with normative engagement, they are worked upon, not worked with, and thus their contribution to the interaction is limited to, at best, obedience – as Harrison [2006] points out, the ultimate responsibility for this sort of rehabilitation's success or failure is placed solely upon the shoulders of the offender based upon whether they comply or don't. In a similar fashion, the meaning of the officer's function is also transformed, focussing not on humanisation (either through engagement or addressing individual problems), but technical management and supervision to ensure the programme/treatment process is carried out [Kemshall, 2010]. The danger is that meaningful communication between officer and offender ceases: not only is there no dialogue, but interaction is reduced to assessment of risk/need and a mechanised response [McNeill, 2006; Burnett, Baker and Roberts, 2007].

As a final note, it should be stressed that the spectrum between normative engagement and pragmatic assistance is fluid – there are models capable of combining elements from both to form hybrid rationales. Thus, for instance, Armstrong and Weaver's findings [2010] demonstrate the officer as someone with whom a meaningful relationship can be developed, but also someone with whom the offender can discuss their problems in order to receive direction towards specialised help – suggesting a cyclical interplay

between engagement, trust, help and change within a developing, dialogic interaction. In further research [Weaver and Armstrong, 2011], a Janus-like balance emerges between the two rationales: normative engagement seeks to address, understand and change past offending behaviour, while pragmatic assistance looks to facilitate this change in the future (dealing with substance abuse, employment, housing, etc.). A balance can be struck between the offender being, and being seen as, an individual in need of both guidance and help, within a communicative context that encourages the officer's respect and support [Lewis, 2014]. Consider, for instance, the recent desistance model largely under adoption by the SPS [McNeill and Weaver, 2010; McNeill, 2012], which divides the desistance process (and the attendant elements required for both officers and offenders interacting within that context) into several elements: a positive relationship is an essential foundation to develop and maintain the offender's motivation towards change, but there is also a requirement for practical skills and opportunities to enable that motivation. Desistance is not only concerned with creating a crime-free gap in the offender's life, but ultimately encouraging and enabling the offender to alter and support a new self-identity, from 'offender' to something more positive that cements a new law-abiding lifestyle [McNeill, 2013].

It is, however, important to emphasise the particular perspective of the offender before moving on. This is not to say that the offender is incapable of adopting the rationales discussed above – as seen, numerous conceptualisations of both normative engagement and pragmatic assistance are predicated on the offender adopting, at least to some degree, a complimentary meaning as to why they interacts with the officer [Bottoms and McWilliams 1979; McCulloch, 2005; Fitzgibbon, 2007; Weaver and Armstrong, 2011]. However, there still remains a fundamental difference between officer and offender that theoretical models tend to overlook. The officer is there in a professional capacity: they have chosen to be part of a profession that is a stakeholder to such interactions, and to one extent or

another believe in the rationales discussed here [Annison, Eadie and Knight, 2008]. The offender, on the other hand, is there as part of a punishment, and while their consent to a CPO is a requisite of its imposition [Scottish Government, 2010a], this nevertheless places them in a different position. An entirely separate level of meaning exists as to why the offender participates (and, to a lesser extent, how they participates) in the interaction, which can most effectively be summed up in the term 'compliance'.

From the offender's perspective, the issue of compliance represents a complex array of potential meanings they may contribute to the interaction. Bottoms [2001] provides a useful summary of these elements, discussing that the offender might be motivated to interact with their officer because of: instrumental, rational calculation that non-compliance will be met with adverse sanctioning; restrictions placed upon them that limit their ability to refuse compliance (potentially including power-disparity relationships cowing them into submission); routine, habitual adherence to rules; and normative compliance, whether through conscious acceptance of a rule, consequentialist reasoning (compliance for the sake of some further reason, such as a loved one), or because they recognises the legitimacy of the authority in question. Braithwaite's 'postures' [2003] – attitudinal meanings that influence individuals' interactions with others – present a complementary picture: deference postures ranging from commitment to capitulation, reflecting the degree of willingness and legitimacy-recognition the offender is bringing to the interaction but nevertheless representing compliance; or defiance postures, representing resistance (varying degree of non-compliance), disengagement (an absence of caring one way or the other with regards to compliance) or game-playing (compliance to suit one's own meanings).

It is therefore important to understand that, while an offender may readily seek pragmatic assistance, or come to accept normative engagement, an underlying set of meanings is at work, rooted in the inescapable nature of the officer-offender interaction as part of a penal

sanction.

Process

Second only to 'why?' as the foremost underlying question of the probation relationship is 'how?'. By what process does their interaction take place, and what consequences might that have for what it means to be an officer or offender?

Returning to the traditional model of probation, Davies discusses the relationship between the officer and offender as 'the probation officer's main instrument' [1969, p121] for achieving change in the offender. Burnett and McNeill [2005] provide a useful summation of this interpersonal-centric approach, ranging from a missionary befriending/conversion to the social casework model. At its core, this process of interaction can be said to be founded on a strong, purposeful relationship between the two stakeholders (whether this take the form of mentoring, professional friendship or casework [Durnescu, 2012]). In Weaver and Armstrong's research [2011], it was noted that offenders placed considerable value on an officer personalising their interaction: providing one-to-one attention, being attentive to the offender's needs, and tailoring their intervention to the offender's individual characteristics. The offender must be open to this relationship and believe the process can be effective, while the officer must possess concern for the offender and seek to achieve some understanding of them. Rex [1999] (supported by Lewis [2014]) similarly demonstrated that offenders feel most committed and positively engaged when officers empathise with and respect them, listen and show interest/understanding and give them the opportunity to talk – with Lewis adding that the most important element to a positive relationship was the officer demonstrating a genuine belief in the offender and their capacity to change (although, importantly, not being afraid to challenge offenders in a constructive manner). Similarly, Grant and McNeill's research [2015] illustrates the importance to officers of a 'reciprocal and meaningful relationship' based on trust, confidence, motivation and

inspiration between the two stakeholders is to quality supervision. Anderson [2016] likewise discusses the importance, within the specific context of a desistance-based relationship, of the officer 'bearing witness' to the offender: not only allowing the offender to express their experiences (emphasising offenders' inequalities, challenges and trauma rather than their offending behaviour), but recognising the validating and humanising power of attending and responding to that expression, as opposed to a strictly instrumental narrative of 'help'.

The ideal is that such a relationship allows the offender an active role in the interaction: as was found in Rex's study [1999], successful behavioural change was attributed to meaningful offender participation and commitment, generated by officers' personal engagement with them in a reasonable, invested and encouraging manner, thus engendering with them an interpersonal relationship beyond simply the professional officer-offender functions. Similarly, in McCulloch's research [2005], offenders likewise found an interaction process that favoured the development and usage of their personal relationships with officers to be the most effective in encouraging desistance [supported by Robinson et al., 2014 for officers, and Barry, 2000 for both officers and offenders]:

“probationers in this study indicated that talking about their problems often involved a process of problem clarification and identification, a process considered central in enabling probationers to understand their problems and in turn address them. Talking about problems was also frequently used to refer to dialogue which incorporated the provision of advice and guidance, the development of thinking skills and practical problem solving.” [McCulloch, 2005, p16]

While the offender is allowed to express themselves, the officer undergoes a 'controlled emotional investment' [Worrall and Hoy, 2005]: they sensitise themselves to the offender as an individual, seeking to understand the

meanings at work in their expressions, accepting the offender as they are – strengths, weaknesses, behaviours and values – and, as a result, responds in a significant and productive way [Biestek, 1961]. The additional benefit, noted by Fitzgibbon [2007] is that the offender can be understood as a ‘whole individual’, rather than an artificial construct of pre-conceived and listed factors and facets.

However, it is important to note that such an interpersonal process is not necessarily as positive as previously outlined; personalised relationships can, instead of focussing on allowing the offender’s expression and emphasising the officer’s invested response, concern themselves with strict, aggressive ‘tackling’ of an offender’s problem factors:

“Having to engage with an authoritative professional who regularly questions the whys and wherefores of your life and faces you with the consequences of your behaviour”. [National Probation Directorate, 2003, p7]

The distinction here is a lack of both acceptance and non-judgementalism on the part of the officer, and self-determination for the offender [Worrall and Hoy, 2005] – it is not a voluntary interaction, but an enforced monitoring. This model of the interpersonal process still uses a strong, defined relationship between the two stakeholders, but there is no effort at understanding or cooperation; engagement is hierarchical, with the officer in power and the offender pre-defined – in such case, an interpersonal relationship still exists, but it is a detrimental, ‘psychonoxious’ one [Burnett and McNeill, 2005].

Day, Hardcastle and Birgden [2012] classify this interpersonal-based interaction (what they term ‘personal engagement’) as one end of a continuum of officer-offender processes, with the other end taking the form of what they term ‘brokerage’: a more distinct relationship between the two stakeholders focussed on the officer coordinating services designed to

address aspects of the offender and ensuring the offender complies with this modular process. The obvious risk with such a brokerage relationship is that this greater distance between the two stakeholders results in a fundamental breakdown in any meaningful interaction, resulting in what Kemshall [2010] terms a 'technist' approach to offender supervision, with a complex risk scheme dictating the response of practitioners and railroading offenders into particular programmes and treatments. Rather than services being brokered on the basis of an individualised, collaboratively-reached understanding of an offender and their case [McNeill and Weaver, 2010], neither officer nor offender possesses any meaningful degree of interaction, agency or determination: the process of intervention is prescribed by an external framework of abstract factors, to be managed (assessed, planned, resourced, implemented, monitored and enforced all according to a rigid system) by the officer, and the programme of service content complied with by the offender [Robinson, 2005; Burnett, Baker and Roberts, 2007]. Indeed, the only meaningful interaction between the two offered by such a model is meetings where the officer encourages compliance and motivation from the offender [Burnett, Baker and Roberts, 2007]. Furthermore, as Partridge [2004] notes, the greater the degree of separation between supervision elements, married with the absence of meaningful interaction with the officer, the greater the offender's confusion as to the purpose of the whole process.

The argument could be made, however, that this brokerage process is not necessarily as atrophied, at least in comparison to the interpersonal process, as it might first appear. On a very basic level, touched briefly upon above, the identification of problem factors and referral to specialised services to address those factors could be considered an effective support mechanism for the central officer-offender relationship – especially in a relationship context that recognises and respects the offender as a dynamic, change-capable agent [Raynor, 2001]. Grant and McNeill [2015], for instance, discuss officers' need to provide external services such as employment support, mental health services and accommodation in order to

create a quality service for offenders. In a similar vein, consider Duff's model for transformative punishment [2003a; 2003b]: a focussing instrument through which the offender can be encouraged to recognise their wrongdoing and its implications, resulting in a normative change and a sincere desire to seek reparation and reconciliation. Obviously, the question arises: what is left for the officer to do, other than oversee compliance during this aspirationally moral 'service'? One potential answer might expand upon the notion of compliance, as Robinson and McNeill [2008] do: the officer as a broker of this particular 'service' does not just seek to ensure the offender's formal compliance with the rules, but their substantive compliance – that is, their engagement with the spirit and purpose of the punishment, encouraging and facilitating the change envisioned. Similar to the supportive role envisaged by Bottoms and McWilliams [1979], the officer's responsibility becomes an ongoing engagement with the offender to support their continuing motivation and any underlying normative change the brokered services are effecting. In a probation model that emphasises the role of the community, this idea of an officer as a normative broker has even greater potential significance: overseeing not only the effective management of services and the offender's investment, but acting as the offenders agent with the community to ensure their investment also – understanding the nature of the community, its relationship with the offender, the key figures to facilitate reintegration and the steps necessary to ensure long-term support and resilience after the sentence is completed [Raynor, 2001; Spencer and Deakin, 2004].

Again, much as with the relationship's potential rationales, the distinction between interpersonal and brokerage processes is not always a binary choice between one or the other. McNeill's three necessary conditions for effecting offender change [2009b] demonstrate a hybrid view of their communicative process: on the one hand, a strong interpersonal relationship is necessary to develop and maintain offender motivation, but the officer must also act as a broker to ensure the offender receives not only training to develop necessary internal skills but also the external opportunities to realise

that motivation. In this respect, brokerage is an extension of the individualised, dynamic foundation provided by the interpersonal relationship, recognising the capacity for strengths and assets within the offender to facilitate change [Maruna and LeBel, 2003]. Armstrong and Weaver's research presents a more limited, but still fundamentally similar, process in practice: the officer presents an opportunity for an offender not only to receive 'the full attention of somebody with whom [they] have developed a relationship of trust... [but] a meaningful opportunity to talk over problems and get specialised help' [2010, p15].

Significance

One of the most pressing influences on the actual significance of interactions between officers and offenders must surely be the punishment context within which (at least with regards to the CPO [Scottish Government, 2010]) the relationship takes place. Certainly, there are commentators who argue that punishment is a negative influence – that seeking 'pain and suffering' is anathema to a service geared towards 'mutually respectful working relationships with offenders, which then provide a basis for constructive challenge' [Hignett, 2000, p52]. This has a potential effect upon the stakeholders similar to that of the technist brokerage process discussed above: it diminishes their interaction to a matter of enforcement and management, with the only significant communication taking place being that of 'the enforced re-education of offenders to redress their deficits and to develop within them the requisite skills for compliant citizenship' [McNeill, 2004, p242]. Even if such hardline significance is not realised, there is still the risk of punishment skewing the nature of the relationship. Mair and Canton [2007] discuss how punishment as a pressing requirement invites a cooling of the officer-offender relationship: the diminishment of meaningful offender choice, agency and collaboration in the name of 'rigour' and 'discipline', and the recalibration of the officer's role as providing 'hard tasks' and 'firm encouragement'. A potential reason for this cooling is that,

regardless of how hardline or merely 'firm' a punishment stance is, if that stance is adopted for the sake of third parties – the abstract community or general public – then it is not for the sake of the offender; the perceived desires of others (for more apparent toughness, or a greater sense of security derived from heightened enforcement) are placed ahead of the needs of the offender [Hedderman and Hough, 2004]. We might, to distinguish what comes next, label this particular punishment stance 'punitivism' – punishment significance for its own sake (or, rather, the sake of what it signifies to observers outside the officer-offender relationship), with the officer working for that third party, rather than for the offender, who is at best a demonstrative tool and at worst an enemy. As Robinson and Ugwudike [2012] note, placing probation on a punitive continuum means its significance has to demonstrate 'punitive credentials': to avoid being declared soft or favouring offenders, the relationship must inject significance to demonstrate enforcement, penal 'bite' and disciplining of offenders. From the offender's perspective, such a punitive stance may only exacerbate their sense of stigmatisation, alienation and 'otherness', leading to a rejection of the officer and the entire criminal justice system and an entrenchment of their criminality [Becker, 1963; Muncie, 2011].

However, this argument also provides a convenient bridge to the necessary counter argument that punishment does have a positive potential in terms of the officer-offender relationship's significance. Just as there is disintegrative shaming, so too is there reintegrative shaming: a marriage of punishment and rehabilitation where disapproval is expressed in order to invoke remorse and encourage change. This stance has obvious ties with Duff's theory of punishment [2003a and b], discussed above: the idea that just because the offender is being punished does not mean they are any less of an individual agent; the offender is not a tool to be used or an enemy to be hated and feared; although the offender has done wrong, and deserves to be punished, that punishment is an opportunity to reach out and help them to change; this presents a valuable opportunity that the officer can, indeed must

if it is to succeed, facilitate (all of which is reinforced by Robinson's notion of expressive punishment [2008]). By changing how punishment is presented to the offender, and how they might perceive it in a different, more positive, light, the outcome of such significance can be changed radically. This is paralleled in Hayes' discussion [2015] on the 'pains' of community penalties, especially the 'pains of rehabilitation': a fully-engaged offender may perceive their punishment as deserved within the context of ongoing efforts at behavioural change (with attendant pains related to the difficulties of change, and the shame felt at their past actions), those offenders who are only partially-engaged may minimise or deflect their responsibility through the use of contextual factors.

However, a preponderance of punishment risks skewing the interaction's understanding of offenders, placing too great an emphasis on individual, moral responsibility, and failing to acknowledge the wider factors contributing to their offending. A second pressing issue in terms of the significance of officer-offender interactions is thus how an offender's 'risks and needs' are factored into the relationship. Models such as Risk, Need and Responsivity (RNR) [Bonta and Andrews, 2010] place this concept at the core of the relationship's significance: the offender's risk level determines the degree of treatment, whilst their particular needs determine the particular significance (interventions targeted identified criminogenic factors), with responsivity affording the interaction a degree of flexibility in adapting to the offender's learning style [Bonta et al., 2008]. On the surface, this significance does demonstrate some positive potential: content is tailored to target elements of offending behaviour capable of being changed, which is done in such a way as to address any complicating factors that might arise (such as low offender motivation or ineffective intervention delivery). However, the obvious counter argument is that in this process, the offender does not really have any participation in shaping the content – elements of their behaviour or background are targeted for change, but they do not determine what elements these are or how they are addressed [Day, Ward and Shirley,

2011]. The officer is, arguably, also railroaded into prescribed methods of assessment and consequent intervention, as opposed to working out practical details alongside the offender [Burnett, Baker and Roberts, 2007]. Such significance is a slippery slope, leading to attitudes that treat the officer's role as 'correcting' an offender's 'deficits', with responsivity being less an issue of tailoring content to better fit the offender's difficulties and instead becoming a matter of enforcement [Kemshall, 2010; Deering, 2014]. The concern becomes not a question of solving the offender's issues, but minimising the societal risks presented by them through techniques such as self-management [Harrison, 2006]. Much as with punitivism above, the ultimate risk is that risk/need significance becomes a focus not concerned with the offender, but for the sake of the external 'society' – feeding a public protection ethos that slants the relationship directly into one of controlling the offender in order to guard against and/or correct a threat to the public [Burnett, Baker and Roberts, 2007]. Furthermore, the discourse of an offender's 'needs' as those factors which cause offending behaviour invites troubling potential conclusions: even setting aside an external agenda of public protection, this idea of criminogenic needs suggests the offender is somehow 'faulty' or 'deficient' [Kendall, 2004], a set of solvable problems to be fixed through treatment, rather than a complex individual to be engaged with and helped.

In contrast, McCulloch's research [2005] suggests a subordinate role for risk discourse within the significance of officer-offender relationships: its findings indicated practitioners achieved a reduction in reoffending (i.e. 'solving' criminogenic factors) through addressing an offender's wider social problems through collaborative, interactive engagement, rather than targeted cognitive behavioural treatment. Rather than specifically focussing on an offender's risks and 'needs' as a particular element of the relationship's significance, the stakeholders instead adopted a broader perspective, focussing on external issues and personal support. Similarly, the Good Lives Model inverts the significance of risks/needs: a similar focus on key aspects

of the offender's character, but based on supportive normative assets [Ward, 2010; Day, Ward and Shirley, 2011].

It might be argued, despite the growing influence of punishment and risk discourse over the significance of officer-offender relationships, that the core theme of their interactions remains one of change: Annison, Eadie and Knight's research [2008] points to a 'commitment to helping people change' as one of the core rationales given for becoming a probation officer, an aspect of the role that has arguably been integral for much of its recent history [Davies, 1969]. As already discussed above in terms of rationale, the precise nature of achieving change is an open one: through the medium of compliance, Ugwudike [2010] discusses change-based significance as focussing both on problem-solving and the deeper significance of the officer engaging the offender in an empathic and mutually interactive relationship. Based on Lewis' findings [2014], change significance would appear, at least in positive cases, to favour the offender regardless of the particular conceptualisation (i.e. engagement vs. assistance) – their motivation to change is integral to the significance's successful delivery [see also McNeill and Weaver, 2010], which can only come from the offender; thus it is the officer's role to support this motivation, requiring a range of legitimacy investment, compliance, respect, engagement and assistance [supported by research from Fenton, 2013; and King, 2013], regardless of whether change is achieved through the construction of a new, positive self-conceptualisation [Ward, 2010], normative/pragmatic problem solving [McCulloch, 2005] or the development of skills and/or opportunities to facilitate desistance [McNeill and Weaver, 2010].

However, one must tread cautiously with change-based discourse – there exists a danger that such significance, despite best intentions, can come to mirror that of risk/need discourse's worst potentials. Consider, for instance, Von Hirsch's discussion of rehabilitation: an effort to 'cure' offending behaviour through 'changing an offender's personality, outlook, habits, or opportunities' [1998, p1]. Although obviously not guaranteeing a slip into the

same sort of impersonal, mechanised, domineering significance, there is clearly the potential here for 'cure' to transform from something collaboratively sought to an enforced social medicine. Indeed, the wider panoply of change targets mentioned by Von Hirsch invites a more sinister array of interventions than cognitive behavioural treatment's more limited focus on self-policing techniques. Consider again, for instance, Porporino and Fabiano's approach to case management [2008]: the use of subtle influence to effect change in offenders, avoiding the sense of coercion and instead making them think their new pro-social identity is a product of internal motivation, rather than external influences. To a lesser extent, Trotter's discussion of pro-social modelling [2008] indicates a similar form of change-based significance less concerned with explicit interaction, and more focussed on subtle manipulation of the offender (erring, at points, into the downright Pavlovian).

Offender-Beneficiaries – The Significance of Unpaid Work

Rationale

Why impose unpaid work upon an offender? What rationale does having them carry out tasks for beneficiaries serve, and how does this rationale impact upon their interaction with said beneficiaries?

Young [1979] (and, more contemporarily, Weaver and Armstrong [2011]) provide a useful cross-section of the meanings the offender might experience as a result of undertaking unpaid work; or, at least, meanings which are envisaged as being pertinent to the ideal experience of unpaid work. Obviously, on the one hand, these evidence a punishment rationale – the offender is expected to experience the 'pains' of having a segment of their free time deprived from them, and the discipline of the imposed work environment – but the greater focus, especially in Young's discussion, is upon reparation. Unpaid work can be characterised, both in abstract and by the offender carrying it out, as a symbolic, constructive act of recompense [McNeill, 2010]: the offender is fulfilling a duty to undo an injury to society (his

crime) through an effort to carry out some form of repairing contribution to society (the unpaid work). In so repairing, they also repair the damage done to their status by their crime – through reparation, a moral debt is settled, potentially a deeper normative atonement is offered up by the offender, and supposedly the status quo is restored [Young, 1979]. Weaver and Armstrong [2011] expand upon this reparative rationale: their research with offenders highlights a greater significance to the work than simply an undoing of social injury. To the offenders in their study, unpaid work represented not just the undoing of their wrong/paying back of their debt, but a meaningful, positive opportunity to help and give something back. Critical to this perception was not just the offenders seeing their work as a positive contribution to society, but being seen likewise by beneficiaries. This suggests a vital role in the interaction for beneficiaries' own meanings: by transforming how they see the offender, from harmful drain upon society to a valued contributor to its improvement, they act as the catalyst to the offender's own change in self-perception.

Rex [2002] presents a similar message, but one that provides a meaningful bridge between the underlying punishment rationale and reparation, allowing the former to serve as more than just a formal penological prerequisite. 'Hard treatment', as Rex characterises it, has an almost Duffian [2003b] role to play: it expresses a collective censure of the offender's act, in an effort to reinforce within the offender's own interpretation the act's wrongness and instil a remorseful desire to achieve reparation. However, there are obvious risks with harnessing as unstable a force as punishment: its use by higher powers – in Rex's discussion, magistrates – as a threat regarding the tougher sanctions that will follow continued offending invites, at best, a more prudential response from the offender (carrying out the unpaid work to avoid greater punishment, rather than a sincere change in perception) and at worst an antagonistic stance (perceiving the work as an illegitimate infliction). Consider Casey's conceptualisation of unpaid work [2008], demonstrating a full realisation of the punitive stance: unpaid work

represents a symbolic act to beneficiaries not of the offender's desire to undo their offence, but of the government's tough stance on criminals. Reparation ceases to be the offender's opportunity to change beneficiaries' perception of them, and becomes beneficiaries' opportunity to exact a metaphorical pound of flesh (most likely reinforcing a negative perception into the bargain).

A far more productive association is discussed [Rex, 2002] in the combination of censure with the offer of a second chance, encouraging the offender to enter into the unpaid work with the perception of it as the chance for a new beginning, to make right their wrongs and prove themselves a better person – again, both to beneficiaries and themselves. The only problem with this model is the limited role beneficiaries have to play in the actual interactions with the offenders, representing little more than a (perhaps notional) audience to their change or, in a more meaningful capacity, evoking in their framework a symbolic 'victimhood' that can demonstrate the offenders' harmful acts, emphasising both censure and the need to change. However, at least in contrast with Casey's vision for unpaid work, this has the opportunity to encapsulate Maruna and King's counter-argument [2008] that unpaid work should strive to overcome the retributive, indignant anger that it can so easily evoke in beneficiaries, and instead move their perception towards one similar to that held by the offender: redemption, the opportunity for second chances, and the potential for personal change.

There is also the potential for a reparative rationale to function in a way that primarily focuses on the offender, with beneficiaries largely serving as a passive symbol rather than an interactional partner. Consider, for instance, desistance's emphasis on 'self-narrative' [Cross, 2017], and the importance of offender's journeys away from their offending behaviour being grounded in a change in how they perceive themselves. Reparation - the idea of giving something back or undoing harm - has the potential to facilitate this development in self-narrative with limited real involvement by beneficiaries members. While such involvement, as discussed below, may have additional benefits, it is the interaction between offenders and the

conceptual symbol of beneficiaries that can generate this changed self-perception.

However, this limited role for beneficiaries demonstrates a wider limitation in reparative-founded interactions: less a meaningful meeting of the two stakeholders, and more a bilateral exchange of symbolic gestures (transaction rather than interaction). At worst, such a limited rationale may in fact serve a control function, allowing for what Fitzgibbon and Lea [2010] envisage as a 'polite chain gang': a publicly-visible demonstration of offenders being rendered safe. But arguably even more problematic is that a reparative rationale's ultimate end-state is a integration of status quo ante; the offender's moral debt is repaid and his perceived state is reset to that of an ordinary citizen. Even, arguably especially, when reparation is able to achieve a normative change in offenders' self-perceptions, surely there is the potential for unpaid work to support that change into a meaningfully new, prosocial lifestyle.

Bazemore and Maloney [1994] hint at the opportunity for an even deeper rationale to underlie the two's interaction in their mentioning of unpaid work as a way to 'strengthen the bond' between offender and beneficiaries – a symbolic transaction is the minimum standard to which unpaid work should aspire; the work should also bring the offender and beneficiaries together. Consider, then, one of the most interesting findings of McIvor's research from the 90s [1992]: offenders who had a great deal of direct contact with the beneficiaries of their unpaid work were more likely than those without as much contact to have found their community service worthwhile, and those that found it a worthwhile experience demonstrated lower reconviction rates. As Raynor [2001] points out, the idea of simply returning an offender to their pre-crime situation may not always be productive – especially when their social context is one of criminogenic deprivation – and instead of pursuing reparation, the unpaid work should seek to help the offender achieve a new set of 'pro-social linkages, resources and opportunities'. The contribution of their work is envisaged as not only a material improvement to beneficiaries,

but the very act of the work signifies an effort to promote (i.e. activate as framework elements within beneficiaries) a better, more inter-connected quality of life that leads to the creation of positive, supportive social associations.

We might term this linkage-generating rational 'integrative'. As Raynor [2001] acknowledges, the implication that an offender was ever integrated in the first place may be fallacious, and even so their contextual situation is likely to be one into which their reintegration is not desirable. 'Integration' is not intended to imply moral or behavioural culpability in the offender, but rather to recognise unpaid work's opportunity to generate the human and social capital necessary for desistance [McNeill and Weaver, 2010].

Although unpaid work continues to possess an element of punishment to it, that does not make it inimical to the central driver of this integrative approach: a concept of social healing sought by both parties [McIvor, 2004]. As Robinson and Shapland [2008] note, the core frameworks interacting with one another remain that of the offender being seen (both by beneficiaries and by themselves) as being a valued contributor to society, but this is taken further, acting as a catalyst to generate social capital: long-lasting networks of relationships founded in mutual acquaintance and positive recognition, encouraging the offender's efforts to work towards long-term desistance. Not only does the valuable contribution address potentially negative and stigmatising beneficiary responses [Allen, 2008], but it encourages a constructive, generative response instead. Through integration with beneficiaries, and the assurance that said beneficiaries are pro-social, long-term behavioural and identity change can become entrenched [McNeill, 2014]. Returning to McIvor's research [1998], this would seem to require direct contact between the two stakeholders, with key meanings engaged including trust and confidence, the expression of appreciation and the provision of opportunity. This, in turn, however, would seem to require changes in both stakeholders' perceptions in order to achieve a stable foundation for this interaction: Young [1979] talks about the offender

developing, through the course of their unpaid work, a new outlook on their societal role (presumably with regards to their positive value as a contributing citizen). Beneficiaries, meanwhile, are noted as needing to avoid stigmatising and alienating the offender, and likewise develop a new outlook recognising their positive value as something other than an offending outsider. Most importantly, beneficiaries need to act upon that recognition, providing assistance to offenders in supporting these new identities (both in their own perceptions and on a practical, societal level) through the development of prosocial networks of support [Kilcommins, 2014]. Similarly, albeit perhaps in a more diminished role, it may instead be possible for this ongoing relationship to be formed not between offenders and individual beneficiaries, but between an offender and a beneficiary organisation (typically an intermediary for whom offenders have carried out work). Such a relationship would still be capable of providing reintegrative support to offenders through the provision of work, human capital and pro-social linkages [McIvor, 2016].

Process

It is possible to read the interactive process of unpaid work in the same light as Maruna's posited reintegration ritual: a challenge that expresses the offender's effort at 'atonement', 'redemption' and 'reconciliation' [2011, p4] (or, in less grandiose terms, 'an expression of an offender's desire and commitment to paying back to beneficiaries for their wrongdoing' [Weaver and Armstrong, 2011, p28]), and more importantly represents an effort to change their status from offender back to a legitimate citizen of society. The public nature of unpaid work would seem to enhance this argument for its prospective process, as Maruna advocates that such a reintegrative ritual cannot take place in private, but must be witnessed – however, this does seem to relegate beneficiaries' role to that of acknowledging the completion of the former-offender's 'challenge', and accepting the change this represents.

Young phrases this performative process of unpaid work in a different

way. In discussing the offender's act of reparation, Young explores the symbolism of such an act: 'by performing work of benefit to beneficiaries, the offender is converted from being a drain on its resources to being a useful contributor to its general welfare' [1979, p36]. This, with the further addition of Young's explicit understanding of unpaid work as atonement for the offence committed, bears remarkable similarities to Maruna's model: in both cases, the work possesses a symbolic quality that is activated by the offender's doing of said work, evoking a change in the offender's status and seeking the audience's recognition of that change. Young emphasises this last point in particular, discussing how the offender's performance means nothing if beneficiaries' perception of them does not change appropriately. While the offender's own internal perspective can be altered, reparation is not wholly effective unless it is being seen to be done – Weaver and Armstrong [2011] discuss how reparation can encourage a more positive self-conceptualisation for offenders, but also emphasise the importance of beneficiaries recognising and appreciating offenders as providing helpful, redeeming recompense. Bazemore and Boba [2007] see the process as more transactional: the offender demonstrates competence, reliability and trustworthiness, and in exchange beneficiaries extends acceptance and offers reintegration. By contrast, focussing instead on a more insular process, it may very well be that such a performance is calibrated predominantly towards the offender, with the reparative effort acting as a form of 'de-labelling' as the initial step towards a tentative form of identity reconstruction based around a more positive self-conceptualisation [Maruna and LeBel, 2010; Graham, 2016].

However, if we are to discuss how unpaid work is a potential performance by the offender, we cannot escape the symbolic nature of such work as a punishment. No matter what else the offender might represent in carrying out unpaid work, at least under the CPO, they also represent an individual being punished. As discussed previously, punishment can be understood in a positive, or at least constructive, manner: the expression of censure and disapproval by the state designed to impress upon the offender,

and encourage them to accept, the wrongness of their behaviour [Rex, 2002]. Whether based on instrumental reasoning (that continued wrongdoing will lead to stricter sanctioning) or normative acceptance (the taking of a second chance to change one's behaviour), the fact that the offender carries out unpaid work within a punitive context does not necessarily negate the performative process discussed. Indeed, if one follows the Duffian argument [2003], normative acceptance enhances Maruna's notion of symbolic atonement by the offender adopting the punishment as an expression of their sincere, remorseful change. Punishment, in this sense, can simultaneously encourage the offender to adopt the work as a method of symbolic communication, and enhance the message their performance evokes.

Yet punishment can risk spiralling out of control, leading to a process that is less about the offender making some symbolic performance of their own, and more about the offender being forced to act out a punitive spectacle for a public audience. On the most basic level, community penalties are invariably symbolic restitution: the offender carrying out work that benefits beneficiaries [McIvor, 2016]. At its smallest and most restricted, the anxiety over beneficiaries viewing this punishment as a 'soft option' compared to incarceration harnesses this restitution into a spectacle process: implementing demonstrably tough work and strict surveillance methods for offenders in their unpaid work serves only to make clear to the public that beneficiaries punishment can be strict and demanding [Worrall and Hoy, 2005]. In such cases, while the offender is still performing a symbolic act through the carrying out of their work, their performance has nothing to do with their own change, but rather exists as a spectacle to satisfy popular desires: the offender is forced through a retaliatory, retributive process for the satisfaction of the public's appetite for a 'tough' response to crime [Weaver and Armstrong, 2011]. Take, for instance, the Casey Report's understanding of payback [2008], with its emphasis on being not only highly demanding, involving arduous work members of the public would not voluntarily perform, but highly visible, with offenders wearing fluorescent bibs to indicate their

position. Rather than payback existing as a reparative opportunity for the offender to demonstrate restitution and their utility to society, this concept of payback is only concerned with the significance of their work for the audience's satisfaction - heavy on the symbolic punitivism to satisfy a public appetite, but unconcerned with effective crime reduction [Roberts et al., 2003]. The demonstration of the state's power, on behalf of (or in vengeance of) what is seen as the law abiding majority, is communicated to both stakeholders by the harsh/degrading work itself [Bottoms, 2008]. Worrall and Hoy [2005] draw a comparison with the old notion of the chain gang: a highly visible, heavily laborious punishment that serves no significance for the offender other than shame and physical work, and exists only to satisfy the public desire to see them suffer. If there is any significance for the offender, rather than encouraging integration, this harsh treatment more likely encourages disintegration: the humiliation, disregard and isolation that being made to act in such a spectacle inflicts upon the offender risks destroying their relationship with society [Pamment and Ellis, 2010]. Further, as Canton [2012] notes, punitivism's denouncement of an offender locks them in that very definition, not only setting them as an antagonist against law-abiding society, but exacerbating any effort to alter that identity.

By contrast, unpaid work can potentially represent a process that encourages a strong relationship between offenders and society, in the form of the beneficiaries of their work. Returning to McIvor's study [1992], the findings concerning the effect of positive contact between offenders and beneficiaries has implications beyond a potential integrative rationale. Bazemore and Maloney [1994] talk about bringing offenders and 'conventional adults' together as a key principle of community service in order to create a sense of accomplishment, closure and integration for the offender, as well as a positive contribution for beneficiaries – all of which are reflected in McIvor's findings regarding interaction. Desistance theory [Cross, 2017] emphasises the need for offenders to develop networks of support to sustain their move away from offending, a task to which

community penalties have an opportunity to assist in creating both formal and informal connections within beneficiaries. According to Fox [2016], beneficiaries members may have a vital role to play in facilitating offenders' reintegration, and thus long-term desistance, by envisaging and validating their worth and dignity as the foundation for new social capital, which circles back neatly into the interactions found in McIvor's study and Bazemore and Maloney's vision of community service. Unpaid work provides offenders not only the opportunity to develop a new self, but a forum in which to demonstrate that to local beneficiaries members and thereby develop a network of social support [Bazemore and Boba, 2007]. In this regard, however, it is crucial to emphasise the importance of reciprocation: while it is vital that the offender demonstrate positive contribution and change, that must in turn be responded to by beneficiaries with not only a removal of stigma but the provision of opportunities for new relationships to recognise and support that change [Graham, 2016].

What this suggests is that, much like integration transcends reparation as a rationale, a collaborative process can transcend a performative one. Instead of the offender carrying out expressive work to which beneficiaries bears witness and indirectly reacts, the work may bring offender and local individuals into contact with one another, facilitating a change in both parties [Young, 1979]. For offenders, providing assistance to beneficiaries members, especially those amongst the most vulnerable in society, can not only expiate the sense of wrongdoing surrounding their offence, but encourage a new self-perception founded on the act of giving help; on the other side of the equation, beneficiaries likewise perceives the wiping away of the offender's social debt, and recognises their value to society [Weaver and Armstrong, 2011] (indeed, it may also be hoped that a greater familiarity with the offender ameliorates any punitive attitudes [Butter et al., 2013]). So far, so performative, but this collaborative process goes a step further: the encounters between offender and members of beneficiaries do not end with the offender's performance, but rather last as a series of pro-social

connections and sources of desistance and resilience [Raynor, 2001]. Bottoms, in his 'Civil Renewal and beneficiaries Engagement' model of community payback [2008], discusses how the symbol of unpaid work – a signal of social control and efforts to address wrongdoing – can encourage local residents to intervene in subsequent, problematic situations. Bazemore and Boba [2007] likewise discuss the ability of unpaid work to build social capital between offenders and beneficiaries members: by demonstrating competence and trustworthiness, the offender builds beneficiaries willingness to accept them, forging a new network of relationships that goes beyond the practical reparation of the work by creating an atmosphere of long-lasting, mutual support. In this sense, 'community' becomes less a term of postcode and geography, and instead is defined by those who have a relationship with the offender, established through the unpaid work, but part of an ongoing contribution to their self-perception and desistance [Brownlee, 1998]. Thus this collaborative process actually extends beyond the unpaid work itself; the work is merely a catalyst, the starting point for an ongoing interactive, supportive relationship between the two stakeholders.

Significance

Morris discusses the basic breakdown of what unpaid work should, or at least can, signify: 'Community Service Orders were envisioned as being demanding, of benefit to beneficiaries and, wherever possible, be personally fulfilling for offenders and designed to secure public support for the supervision of offenders in beneficiaries' [1993, p15]. This offers a wide range of potential significances for unpaid work, both from the offender's perspective and that of beneficiaries, but it requires breaking down in order to facilitate further exploration: those meanings invoked by the work itself, and those invoked by the consequences of the work.

Looking at the meanings inherent to the work itself, we can return to Morris [1993]: unpaid work is a disciplining force, requiring offenders to attend a specific place, at a specific time, and perform specific work for a

specific duration (this also has the added benefit of demonstrating the offender's competency, reliability and trustworthiness – all key facets Bazemore and Boba [2007] believe are required for beneficiaries (re)acceptance). For someone who may lead a highly chaotic life, this can certainly represent a challenging, demanding aspect of unpaid work, and indeed supplement the notion of lost leisure time as the punitive sting of unpaid work (an argument backed up by McIvor [1992]). In addition, this idea of discipline is significant not only for the offender, but also for beneficiaries: Bazemore and Boba [2007] discuss how this requirement to be present and perform to a certain standard of quality not only teaches the offender discipline, but demonstrates it to beneficiaries in a practical way, allowing the offender to display themselves as a competent, reliable individual. Unpaid work shows the offender to be competent, reliable and even trustworthy, and as a result builds beneficiaries' willingness to reintegrate them. With particular reference to the significance of the work as a punishment, even that can be examined for significance beyond the surface detail: a way to encourage the offender to make contact with the impact of their offending, counter-balanced with the offer of redemption and the message evoked to beneficiaries that they can represent a positive contribution to society [Rex, 2004].

However, the notion of a disciplining, demanding significance to unpaid work can slip into a more punitive stance. Community penalties, by virtue of being penal disposals, inescapably have a core element of punishment - achieved at the most minimal level by the so-called 'fine' on an offender's time [McIvor, 2016] - but what is done with that element can vary drastically. Worrall and Hoy [2005] (backed up by Rex [2002]) discuss a somewhat restrained standpoint, where the restriction of liberty and inconveniences imposed by unpaid work can be presented as a moral communication to the offender, obliging them to face the reasons for their offending, its consequences and the need for reparation. That being said, there is still the risk, noted by Oldfield [1993], of the punitive significance of unpaid work exceeding the notion of 'fine' and eclipsing any other

significance – if the focus of the work is too heavily centred on it being demanding, it threatens to pay little to no attention to making the work productive or constructive (the classic example being the ‘chain gang’ [Worrall and Hoy, 2005] – a sanction concerned only with a demanding, punitive form of work, serving no other purpose than a visual spectacle of punishing conditions). This invites the dangers of a fully punitive spectacle, the significance of which is obvious for the public: the offender is marked and shamed as a wrongdoer, subjected to hard work and personal embarrassment, alienation and isolation, for what they has done [Pamment and Ellis, 2010]. By contrast, the significance of such work for the offender is one of injustice [Sherman, 1993], where the offender feels they has been done wrong and stigmatised by society, cut off from it, with no hope of forgiveness or recognition of any redeeming (or, at least, redeemable) qualities. Thusly stigmatised, the offender’s illegal behaviour becomes entrenched.

If, by contrast, unpaid work is understood more in line with the notion of payback posited by the McLeish Commission [2008] – that is, a reparative performance rather than a retributive spectacle – then the work carries with it an inherently reparative significance: it is a symbolic effort by the offender to help others, undoing the damage their offence has caused both to beneficiaries and their own standing [McIvor, 1992; Weaver and Armstrong, 2011]. If we return to Maruna’s idea of the reintegration ritual [2011], unpaid work is a public challenge undertaken by the offender that demonstrates their personal change in a practical, tangible way, thus inviting a reconceptualisation of them by beneficiaries (a similar argument is posited by Young [1979]). Punishment may still be a significant intent, but as Morris [1993] notes, this follows the ‘prison as punishment’ line of thinking, with unpaid work inherently achieving its punitive sting through the loss of leisure time but still capable of giving the offender a sense of meaningful achievement, rather than the ‘for punishment’ conceptualisation that demands the work itself be harsh and/or demeaning. This, in contrast to the

punitive-centric significance of unpaid work, encourages a far more constructive set of meanings for both stakeholders:

“Desires for revenge and retribution, anger, bitterness and moral indignation are powerful emotive forces, but they do not raise confidence in probation work – just the opposite. To do that, one would want to tap in to other, equally cherished emotive values, such as the widely shared belief in redemption, the need for second chances, and beliefs that all people can change.” [Maruna and King, 2008, p347]

Moving on to the consequent significances of unpaid work, the most obvious significances are associated with the result of the work itself: Morris discusses how producing a tangible, visible product not only creates a sense of benefit to beneficiaries (supported by Raynor [2001], who argues for an emphasising of the benefits of unpaid work and broader rehabilitation to beneficiaries as a means to better dispose the public towards beneficiaries-based sentences), but also a sense of achievement in the offender [1993]. Weaver and Armstrong's offenders [2011] offered a similar perspective, wherein the completion of unpaid work created a new, more positive sense of self, reflected in and enhanced by beneficiaries' recognition of the work and its value. Unpaid work creates a positive contribution to beneficiaries, but underlying that is, ideally, the signification of personal growth by the offender – a new facet to their identity formed by providing a positive contribution to society – and a corresponding change in how beneficiaries perceives them – from drain on resources to a useful contributor to society's welfare [Young, 1979; Frayne, 1993]. As Raynor [2001] observes, unpaid work can demonstrate itself as beneficial to beneficiaries beyond its practical result: fostering a sense of social solidarity between the two stakeholders through the offender's symbolic act of reparation and change. The completion of the work's product represents a symbolic opportunity for the offender to cement a confident self-reconceptualisation, and for beneficiaries to express their

appreciation of the work-made-manifest, and in so doing their acceptance of the offender [McIvor, 1998].

This leads on to the significance of the work's social consequences. Both the integrative rationale and the collaborative process are predicated on the meanings that can be produced as a result of the unpaid work. The former advocates an aspirational, forward-looking purpose to the unpaid work, whereby the interaction between offender and beneficiaries members generates long-lasting social bonds between the two; a sociogenic network of support in the offender's ongoing desistance process, based on the mutual perception of the offender as a positive contributor to society [McIvor, 1998; Marshall, 1999; Robinson and Shapland, 2008; Graham, 2016]. The latter realises this through the significance of the unpaid work: where said work demonstrates the offender's positive potential, fosters confidence between the two stakeholders, beneficiaries are given the opportunity to move past a punitive reaction, express their appreciation to the offender and work with them to realise their reintegration through ongoing, supportive intervention [Young, 1979; Brownlee, 1998; McIvor, 1998; Bazemore and Boba, 2007; Bottoms, 2008]. In this sense, then, the unpaid work's significance is not only a catalyst to initiate this interaction, but the initial forum in which it takes place – more than just a material contribution to the local area, it acts as a turning point in the local social fabric wherein the offender can begin to form new self-perceptions, new associations with those they encounters in the process of their work, and a new status with them [Raynor, 2001].

To end this chapter on a potentially more realist, arguably pessimist note, there is also the argument that, in the absence of any popular recognition of the offender's work, or social connections formed as a result, the performance of unpaid work does have tangible benefits for the offender in the form of job skills, qualifications and enhanced employment prospects [Harrison, 2006]. It could be argued that such a consequence might act as a safeguard against beneficiaries intransigence – or even non-existence – since it still provides an opportunity for the offender to act upon any sense of

personal change generated by the unpaid work; Harrison gives the example of offenders securing jobs with the local council, creating their own desistance-generating linkages with society and perpetuating new self-perceptions as valuable social contributors.

Chapter 4 - Design and Methodology

Designing a research project with the purpose of developing an understanding of how participant interactions produce an intersubjective social reality came with a series of challenges. First and foremost was the challenge of ensuring the project could, to the fullest possible extent, function as an inductive, explorative piece of research [Davies, 2011; Robson, 2011]. Rather than proving or disproving a hypothesis, or examining the field against some external criterion, my priority with this project was to approach the field as though it was a hitherto unexplored phenomenon. This aspiration, which emphasised participants' own perceptions and a naturalistic examination of their interactions (and the consequent realities thereof), required a careful balancing act. On the one hand, a research design that drew too heavily on pre-existing perspectives regarding the field would risk either filtering out potentially novel findings or colouring my own research perspective; on the other hand, a design that lacked a proper degree of guidance would be too loose, resulting in unwieldy fieldwork and an inability to generate meaningful analysis.

I had already endeavoured to construct my project such that its research perspective was informed and guided by more fundamental, ontological presumptions, with the role of the literature being repositioned as a subsequent, comparative analysis in order to contextualise and enhance the project's findings, but that was only the first step. In order to generate a complex understanding of the CPO's rich social tapestry in a way that both elicited and contextualised its deep significances, I required a focussed and purposive design for data-gathering and -analysis, but one that exercised restraint and clarity in the presumptions I brought with me into the field. Thus, throughout the entirety of my project's design, methodology and analysis, my priority was to balance an approach that permitted the necessary space for an open exploration with clearly-defined parameters that ensured my project did not become merely a meandering description of events.

To achieve this, my first step was to construct a set of clear, strongly-emphasised objectives that would serve as the spine of my research. As will be seen, my questions were formulated to be broadly applicable and open to the novel and unexpected. This placed considerable responsibility upon my objectives to act as the guiding structure. Less a set of 'broad statements about the overall goals of the research - the target it hopes to achieve' [Denscombe, 2002], and more a pair of mission parameters that would fundamentally define my actions in the fieldwork and analytical phases of the project:

- 1) To develop an understanding of how, within the context of CPO requirements (specifically supervision and unpaid work) participants' perceptions are expressed through their actions, and how those in turn influence their interactions with other stakeholders.
- 2) To analyse how these interactions construct intersubjective social realities between the participants for the CPO in practice, as well as the nature of these realities.

Within these contextual objectives, my research questions were formulated to achieve two distinct but complementary functions. Firstly, I sought to translate my objectives into explicable steps that facilitate the processes of data-gathering and -analysis, and secondly to create a space where participants can express themselves fully and freely, but which also provides a bridge by which comparisons can be made with wider literature to generate further knowledge [Creswell, 2007]. Thus my research questions are:

1. What perceptions influence participant actions and interactions within their CPO context?
 1. What perceptions underlie their actions' rationales (*why* they (inter)act the way they do)?

2. What perceptions influence their processes of interaction (*how* they interact with other participants)?
3. What perceptions produce the significance of their (inter)actions (*what* do their (inter)actions mean)?
2. What intersubjective social realities are produced by the intermingling of the aforementioned perceptions and actions?

These questions are intended to develop knowledge in multiple ways. At the first and most basic level, these questions provide a structured, analytical framework to describe the stimuli located within the CPO as an interactive space, and as a result describe the CPO as an observed phenomenon itself. This not only allows for the generation of novel knowledge on an under-researched topic, but comparison and contrast to the assumptions and visions present in CPO policy add a further layer of complexity and contribution to the field. Additionally, the structuring of the questions - especially the three facets of question one - are deliberately paralleled in the structuring of this research's literature review. This not only allows the findings produced by these questions to develop and advance existing theories and research, but symbiotically allows those same theories and research to further enhance the findings through critique and parallel evaluation.

Constructing the Case Studies

With these objectives and questions in place, the next step was establishing the shape and format of my research's design. Only a qualitative approach could generate the complex, detailed information and direct participant contact the project required [Creswell, 2007], but that still left a range of design options from which to choose. Given the explorative aspirations and ontological underpinnings of my project, there were several designs that I rejected: an experimental design was unsuitable for the

inability (and undesirability) to control the research environment, as well as the lack of an independent variable for which to control; a cross-sectional design would have allowed for highly variable data to be gained and analysed from multiple sources, but its emphasis on quantifying said variation was antithetical to the project's ethos of in-depth, frontline understanding; and while the project would contain a certain longitudinal element in the form of how relationships and dynamics altered over a given period, this temporal element was not significant enough (both in terms of duration and deliberate research focus) to warrant such a design [Bryman, 2012].

It was clear to me that a case study (or, rather, a pair thereof) approach, with two paired studies on supervision and unpaid work, would allow for a full yet focussed perspective on the complexity and particular nature of a defined phenomenon (i.e. the interactions between participants in the two focal CPO requirements), whilst preserving to the greatest extent the field's context and natural state [Stake, 1995]. For this project, such an approach would allow me to preserve my focal subject - the interactions between CPO stakeholders - in as close to their natural state, and in connection to their wider setting and context, as possible whilst also providing a clearly identifiable research boundary [O'Leary, 2004]. This perspective (when paired with an observation-based methodology) would allow for a strong research equilibrium, balancing on the one hand objective findings with an active, responsive interpretive stance for myself as researcher - allowing for developing analyses to be made, refined and altered as the research progresses and a better understanding is reached [Stake, 1995].

This would, in turn, allow me to place considerable emphasis at the first, data-gathering stage upon participants' own terms, perceptions and meanings, thereby enhancing the analysis at the second stage. Tying these perceptions back into the initial point regarding research perspective, the holistic nature of a case study (again, when paired with an observation methodology), would allow for a strong ethnographic approach, whereby

detailed findings could be generated from a wide range of facets and features within the cases' boundaries, not only capturing the richness of the participants but also providing a wealth of corroborative evidence to support accurate analysis [Creswell, 2007]. Each interactive stakeholder could be treated as an embedded unit of analysis, requiring their own perceptions to be understood in order to facilitate a consequent full and informed understanding of the case itself (that is to say, the interaction between the stakeholders) - as a design feature, this is a close fit with the objectives of this research project.

In addition, rather than attempt to make claims regarding my findings' statistical generalisability to a wider population, a case study would provide justification and validation for an in-depth, detailed examination of a particular instance (or set thereof) of the CPO phenomenon in action (with the added resource benefit of making such a frontline examination practically feasible within the temporal and financial restrictions of a PhD thesis) [O'Leary, 2004].

Given the emphasis on developing a unique understanding of the peculiarities and particulars of the specific cases under study, this project makes no grand claims about the broader 'representativeness' or 'typicality' of said cases. Rather, these cases are worthy of study because of their 'exemplifying' nature [Bryman, 2012]. That is to say, rather than representing some generalisable situation, where the findings of a specific instance can be applied to the whole, the circumstances and conditions of the cases under study instead demonstrate an internal consistency: within their own context and locus, the events studied provide a suitable bounded case within which the research project can answer its questions and fulfil its objectives. While the project cannot make conclusions about the entirety of the CPO from these cases, it can at least state with confidence that its findings were derived from a suitable example of the CPO in practice. To borrow Stake's argument [1995], the purpose of the case study is not typically to understand any case other than the one being studied; what matters is that the case being studied illustrates the matters for which the study is being conducted.

This approach to designing case studies has, however, given rise to its own challenge, namely that of applicability. The purpose of these studies is to delve into the specific nuances and details of particular, definable situations that have been studied. This means it is not possible to claim with any surety that the findings are, strictly speaking, representative of any population beyond that of the direct participants. Instead, the applicability of this project outwith its participant group is to be found in the notion of 'transferability' [Stake, 1995; O'Leary, 2004]. A sufficiently detailed description of the project's contextual and participant details can allow for findings to be transferred from the case setting to alternative settings where similar details are displayed. Thus, for this project specifically, findings may be transferred when participants' subjective meanings are reflected by other stakeholders in the CPO, or when similar interactions take place within the context of either a supervision or unpaid work requirement. In both instances, the intersubjective reality produced by participants in the research can be extrapolated and transferred to the non-research instance.

As a final note on these case studies' design, because of the practical contingencies of access negotiations, both studies became dual studies, each involving two social workers/unpaid work managers and their respective client groups. While these different workers and their groups did not, in either instance, demonstrate such radically different interactions as to facilitate comparison and contrast, in both studies the added variety in particular behaviour and specific details was useful in providing a greater breadth from which transferability could be achieved [Creswell, 2007].

Sampling Selection

With this ethos in mind, the design of this research took the form of twinned observational case studies: one into the interactions between social workers and offender clients in the CPO's supervision requirement (sample: two social workers, with 5-7 clients observed from each of their caseloads),

and the other into the interactions between offender clients and unpaid work beneficiaries (three unpaid work teams of 4-6 clients) in the CPO's unpaid work requirement.

The issue of sampling for this project was complicated by a variety of factors. From a practical standpoint, a realistic prediction of access negotiations, both formally with the gate-keeping organisations as well as informally with potential participants, meant that sampling was often subordinate to limitations and conditions placed on the project. This came down to the question of who amongst the team of social workers and their respective clients was willing to participate, as well organisational factors such as client-sensitive moments or confidential meetings. Although 'necessity' and 'practicality' make for poor descriptors in a sampling strategy, Stake [1995] sets forth the suggestion that a case study's first priority should be the maximisation of learning. To this end, a researcher needs to make best use of their time and access, and thus selecting participants who are readily accessible and hospitable are legitimate strategic choices.

However, that did not completely negate a consideration of how to sample for the project, though even here the theoretical effort proved a challenge. Drawing on Mason's comment [2002] that sampling is a process of selecting a relationship between one's project participants and the wider population from which they're drawn, selection for this particular project was much more an extension of the case study's 'bounding' process than the application of definitive criteria (as already noted, this project does not make any claims as to the representativeness of its sample, only their exemplifying nature). Such criteria would, after all, have carried with them preconceptions about what participants were desirable for the project - social workers who exhibited particular values, or clients who demonstrated a certain degree of compliance, for instance - and thus potentially influenced the findings. With a greater emphasis on holistic integrity, taking a social worker and their client group 'as is', the focus of sampling was less about asking 'who' and 'how many', and more on delineating the limitations of participation [Punch, 1998].

This was primarily addressed through a strong instrumental focus on the participants [Stake, 1995]. This project was focussed less on studying participants as personal individuals (although personal factors such as beliefs, values and external behaviours could provide relevant context and information), but rather participants in their capacities as supervisors, clients or unpaid work beneficiaries interacting with one another. If participants were willing to allow me to observe their meetings and participate in some follow-up discussions about their interactions, then that was sufficient for my basic sampling criteria; matters pertaining to factors outwith the boundaries of the project's central unit of analysis (the interaction of meanings between participants concerning and constituting the CPO) [Yin, 2014] were outwith the focus of this research. Thus the project was interested in what social workers brought to their interactions as social workers, and what clients brought as clients; while this gave rise to a boundary that was fluid, and was a product of personal interpretation, it possessed a definable and verifiable criterion against which sampling could be made.

Indeed, this sampling gave rise to an interesting phenomenon during the unpaid work case study. With regard to local beneficiaries of unpaid work, based on initial projections and expectations made during the research design phase, a series of semi-structured interviews with members of the public was anticipated. However, following the fieldwork concerning unpaid work, it became apparent that due to the nature of the work in question - both the chosen locations of projects, as well as its unpublicised nature - members of the public did not meet the sampling criteria for this project. Simply put, given where projects took place and their lack of awareness of the work, members of the public could not be said to have acted or interacted in any meaningful capacity as stakeholders in the CPO. The public did serve an important symbolic function in their reaction to and engagement with the end results of unpaid work projects, which will be discussed in the relevant chapter, but even this function was carried out unawares. The fieldwork had already emphasised that the interactive dynamic in unpaid work was in reality

between clients and members of the organisations for whom unpaid work was being carried out. These 'beneficiaries' did not interact with clients in a role or capacity as members of the public, but as employees of their organisations, which came to significantly define the nature of said interactions. In this regard the discovery that members of the public were unaware of it did not disrupt the project unduly. It was, nevertheless, a curious phenomenon that would become a key consideration in the discussion of the theme of 'community' within the CPO.

Beyond this central criterion of participants-as-stakeholders, there was also the question of setting/context to address [Hammersley and Atkinson, 1983]. This project largely came with its settings predetermined - the durations of supervision meetings and unpaid work projects respectively - but that did give rise to a chief concern. Given the emphasis on subjective participant meanings, and the recognised fact that such meanings vary for participants between contexts [Crow and Semmens, 2008], the possibility of observing participants outwith focal interactive contexts was considered. However, given the practical inability to carry out such an observation with clients or beneficiaries due to ethical and access limitations, I concluded instead that, while this was the case, such variations were not relevant to the central issue of how interactions constructed the CPO in practice. Based on Gomm's comment on the 'window of observation' [2012], any factor originating outside the observable circumstances of the research, but with relevance to the topic under observation, will be made manifest within those circumstances somehow. Since this project was less concerned with the origins of participants' meanings, and more with how those influenced their interactions and produced intersubjective realities, this appeared a satisfactory compromise between ideal research and achievable practicality.

Observational Method

For both case studies, given the ontological underpinnings of this

project, observation was an obvious choice for the central method of data gathering. An observational approach places emphasis on participants' behaviours, actions and interactions within a particular holistic setting (respectively, the supervision and unpaid work requirements), and the focus on understanding the meanings contained therein through a naturalistic, multi-faceted process [Mason, 2002].

However, for any observational study, the principal concern is the role a researcher should adopt. It was obvious from the outset that an absolute role of either total observer or total participant was undesirable - the former would have prevented a meaningful degree of personal engagement with participants in a purposeful, research-driven manner, while the latter was impossible given my lack of criminal record and/or social work qualifications [Manning, 2001]. Some variable degree of participation was necessary, but defining the nature of that participation was ultimately a product of my data-gathering plan. I was not participating to enable any personal reflection on my own experiences of the research fields [Mason, 2002], but to facilitate informal access with the participants [Bryman, 2012]. 'Participation', to me, meant anything from engaging in informal conversation with participants, either to discuss observed phenomena or simply to develop a more positive and facilitative relationship, or involving myself in unpaid work project to dispel client suspicions or hostility whilst simultaneously building trust and credibility. Some examples include: asking a supervisor after a meeting what they were trying to achieve with a particular phrase or approach they'd used; discussing how clients felt about the morning's unpaid work activity over our lunch break; explaining the nature of my research and its safeguards to a new client or beneficiary member of staff; discussing football in the van drive to or from unpaid work sites (a particular challenge, given my limited sporting knowledge); sympathising with a recent unfavourable court decision or welfare cut.

In simplest terms, participation was a means for me to have some influence over the role to which I was assigned in the fields, allowing me to

manage my physical presence in such a manner as to convey openness and interest, but also a respectful sincerity and restraint [Robson, 2011]. This was supported by the wider context of my presence in both fields, which encouraged participants themselves to assign their own notions of my role. As an external academic carrying out his PhD research, I was seen as a neutral, non-judgemental figure, one interested in developing a personal understanding of the CPO from participants' own perspectives (a notion which my ontology and design certainly facilitated), and not someone who would disclose sensitive matters to others. For instance, whilst carrying out my case study into unpaid work, it was often the case that, after explaining the purpose of my presence to clients as being one of shedding light on how they perceived their work and interactions with its beneficiaries, clients would voluntarily provide a summary explanation of how they felt about the requirement and their situation therein. Challenging moments did emerge, especially during unpaid work in instances where clients' frustration at a particular activity boiled over into resentment at beneficiaries and the CPO in general. In such instances, my neutral stance was perceived as favouring the status quo with which clients were currently unsatisfied. This was, ultimately, a correct perception - the necessities of ongoing access required I maintain a positive, non-disruptive relationship with beneficiaries. Thus while I endeavoured to emphasise my sympathy with clients (aided by the fact that I, too, was working on the same activities, and often frustrated as well), my unwillingness to intervene or voice a common displeasure did mark me out as 'other'. At the very least, clients did not demonstrate any long-term resentment or other reticence that might have complicated my observations.

Research participants often fielded informal social 'tests' to gauge the extent to which they felt it was safe to engage with my research. Supervisors, for instance, probed at an early stage as to the nature of my access negotiations with Social Work Scotland or the City Council; it was essential, in response, to express that while, on the one hand, my research was fully sanctioned and supported, it was also fully independent, and not serving as a

means for other organisations to impose their own priorities and values upon frontline practice. By way of an alternate example, during lunch breaks over the unpaid work requirement, conversations with and amongst clients required keen presence-management: while I lacked the same life experiences as clients, and often did not share their cynicism regarding the criminal justice system, it was nevertheless essential for me to demonstrate sincere empathy with their positions (without, conversely, being perceived as pitying them or otherwise treating them as weak or powerless victims). The best way I discovered to do so was to ask them to tell me their stories - why were they frustrated, what was their grievance. The intent was not to generate additional research data (clients' dissatisfaction with a particular judge, or struggles with benefits bureaucracy, was too removed from the CPO to be workable data), but rather to show respect for clients as individuals by offering my time and attention to them and their concerns.

With informal access secured, the next critical element of my observational methodology was my own perspective. It is a well recognised limitation of observation that, despite its holistic nature, the researcher's own perspective is both limited and selective [Silverman, 2001; Mason, 2002; Robson, 2011]. Rather than make hollow efforts and claims about overcoming this inherent, insurmountable limitation, I instead elected to pursue a strategy concerning where my perspective should be focussed at any given moment during observational fieldwork. What actions to scrutinise? Which participant to focus on during a given moment? What further data would be required to draw even provisional findings about some observed facet? Especially regarding provisional findings, there was considerable challenge to resist premature conclusions; it was necessary to hold observations together in a quantum state: resisting the urge to state a singular meaning, instead asking what multiplicity of potential meanings they might hold, and what further data would be required to verify or disprove these possibilities. In many instances, this guided where I needed to look in order to gather the data necessary to achieve verification or disproving, but

on its own was too limited to serve as the entirety of my perspective strategy. While responsivity was essential to ensure thorough and defensible conclusions, I also needed to remain open to novel observations and, even more importantly, novel perspectives regarding what I observed. Even with a multiplicity of potential interpretations, there nevertheless remained a risk of my thinking becoming staid, formulating, and potentially even self-confirming.

This was where I turned to my research participants for assistance. Given the ontological underpinnings of my research, the fact that participants had their own perspectives on the field was not only a recognised fact, but the very reason for my research and its design [Rock, 2001]. Tapping into their means of interpretation would not only allow me to gain a better understanding of the meaning-generation that acted as the fundamental crucible for the interactions and intersubjective realities that I sought to understand, but would help guide my own perspective strategy by indicated not what I needed to understand, but how participants wanted to be understood.

This lead me to the use of 'ethnographic interviewing' [Heyl, 2001] as a means of both supplementing and informing my observational fieldwork. Much in the same way as conventional qualitative interviews, these were conducted with the intention of gaining insight into participants' own internal perspectives on their surrounding field [Arksey and Knight, 1999], but the interviews' ethnographic nature emphasised positioning participants as teachers, rather than respondents; through the use of open questions formulated to empower the participant, they were able to set the agenda, terms and priorities regarding a particular topic, thus limiting the interviewer's assumptions and pre-determination of their answer. By asking, for instance, a supervisor to explain the importance of their asking a client "where do you see yourself in twelve months' time?", I was able to take a step back and allow participants' perspectives to inform my strategy and supplement my data.

Brought together, the daily approach to fieldwork activities followed

these typical structures. For supervision, I would arrive at the social work centre at 9am to begin the day alongside my participant supervisor. There would be a brief, initial discussion of which clients would have meetings that day. Then, generally a half hour before these meetings were scheduled to commence, we would discuss what plan(s) of action the supervisor intended to pursue - although, as will become obvious later, such plans were frequently subordinated to clients' own priorities they brought into meetings. When time permitted, I would similarly take a few minutes with clients prior to the meeting to discuss what they hoped to achieve in the meeting. Following the meeting, if clients were amenable and available, I would ask them to stay behind for a brief ethnographic interviewing to gauge their perceptions on the meeting - what they felt had been accomplished, or failed to be accomplished, whether or not they were satisfied with what had transpired, etc.. Then I would conduct a similar interview process with the supervisor. The remainder of the day would typically be spent writing a full account of my field notes and maintaining positive, informal access relations with my supervisor participant and the wider workplace.

Unpaid work was, by its very nature, a less structured and more adaptive approach to fieldwork. Days commenced just before 9am, where I would gather alongside clients and unpaid work staff to be divided into semi-regular groups (depending on available space in work vans, and client circumstances). We would arrive at the work site typically around quarter to half past nine, depending on the distance of the site from the social work centre, and this afforded an opportunity for me to conduct informal interviewing with clients concerning their expectations for the day ahead. Once on site, beneficiaries would assign the group a particular task, and my observational period began. Interviewing clients was less rigidly defined compared to supervision, with conversations and discussions achieved in gaps between tasks, or segments of commentary and reaction to the work. Lunch breaks, typically around noon, afforded a more structured opportunity to gauge client perceptions, as well as find beneficiaries free from their own

work to discuss their perceptions on unpaid work and the clients on-site. The afternoon shift followed much the same format and approach as the morning shift, until the work crew left just before 3pm. The ride home afforded one final opportunity to discuss the day's activities with clients, before we returned to the social work centre and dispersed.

In terms of quantification, fieldwork can thus be broken down as:

- On average 6 45-60 minute supervision meetings per week, totalling an estimated 110 hours of observation.
- A sum total of 2-3 hours interviewing per each weekly supervision client, and 1-1.5 hours per each fortnightly supervision client, based on an average 10-15 minutes of interviewing per meeting.
- A sum total of approximately 20-25 hours interviewing per supervisor.
- Three 6 hour unpaid work shifts per week, for three months (12 weeks), totalling 216 hours.
- Quantification of client and beneficiaries interviews undertaken during unpaid work proves difficult, due to the lack of audio recording device on-site. A conservative estimate would place the total useful interview material gained during participant interactions at 3 hours per week for clients, and 1 hour per week for beneficiaries. This would total 36 and 12 hours respectively.

Ethics

This research was approved by the University of Edinburgh, College of Humanities and Social Sciences' Level 2 Code of Research Ethics. In preparing for and conducting fieldwork, there were several key ethical commitments undertaken. The first was respectful, sensitive treatment of all participants to prevent the research from causing or exacerbating psychological distress or harm. Topics of discussion that may have caused such reactions were avoided, and potentially sensitive matters were

approached with the ethos that participants could discuss whatever topics, to whatever extent, they wished, without further prompting or coaxing from me as a researcher.

Second was data protection. Names and key identifying features of participants were altered, by request of City of Edinburgh Council, at the field-note stage of research. A key concern of this research was the potential for participants from any of the three stakeholder groups to give or generate findings that might be construed by government institutions as negative or inconvenient. Anonymisation was the principal safeguard against this risk; however, this did lead to a particular challenge with regards to my two participating social work supervisors. Due to the gender breakdown of the office in which they operated, any presentation of my research findings that used their preferred gender pronouns would have rendered any additional anonymisation efforts meaningless - the participants would have been readily identifiable by anyone with knowledge of that office. Since any such individual would also likely be in a position of organisational power over those same participants, and given the potentially controversial nature of this research's findings, I made the difficult decision to de-gender these two participants, representing them in the final research with gender-neutral names and pronouns. I am fully aware that this decision potentially removes the representation of marginalised voices within criminology - not only based on gender, but potentially other identity characteristics including sexuality and race - and for that I can only take full responsibility. As researcher, I acknowledge this failing, and can only say that it has been done in order to fulfil a more fundamental commitment to ensuring, to my utmost ability, the moral and organisational obligations I have made to protect my research participants.

Finally, but most importantly, was ensuring consensual participation. With the sole exception of the general public in the unpaid work case study, every individual - social workers, clients and beneficiaries (both individual employees and organisations) - received a briefing with regards to the nature

of the research, and informed consent was obtained. Due to the circumstances of the unpaid work field, such briefings often had to be concise, and written consent in the form of signed forms was not always possible, but the utmost effort was undertaken to ensure crucial information was provided in order for their consent to be fully informed. This covered the same details as were contained in participant information sheets: the purpose and uses of the research, reasons why participants are being invited to participate, the voluntary nature of the research, what participation involved (including participants' ability to opt out at any time), and the ethical safeguards put in place to ensure safe, responsible research. Participants were given the opportunity to ask any questions about the research before providing their consent, and said consent was treated as an ongoing topic of negotiation, requiring that I frequently check with participants to ensure they were still willing to participate, and whether they had any desired alterations to the nature of my research presence.

Fieldwork - A Critical Self-Reflection

It is important in any discussion of methodology to not only describe what was intended, how it was executed, and why it was designed thusly, but to reflect upon one's fieldwork and the challenges that were encountered and have emerged as a result.

The first case study undertaken was into the supervision requirement. As stated previous, this was a six-month period, divided into two three-month sections each shadowing a different social worker - Andrew and Gareth - as they met with those clients who were willing to allow me to sit in on their meetings. Meetings lasted between thirty to sixty minutes, generally running towards the shorter end of that spectrum for clients coming to the end of their requirement, while new clients took longer to develop rapport, understanding and problem-solving approaches. Following each meeting, informal, ethnographic interviews were conducted with either the supervisor or client,

sometimes both when possible, in order to develop a better understanding of their perspective on, and indeed in, the meeting. Such interviews were based on open-ended primer questions designed to encourage, and build follow-up questions off, the participant's own perspective - what did they think the meeting was about, what had been done or accomplished, how did they feel it had gone.

The remainder of the observational period for the supervision case study was spent embedded alongside the social worker to which I was currently attached. Initially, I had intended to utilise this ongoing office setting as an additional site for data-gathering: how their daily tasks and casual interactions with colleagues might provide insight into the perspectives they brought into meetings with their clients. However, the decision was made not to incorporate such observational notes from a relatively early stage in the fieldwork process. The first reason for this was that much of the office activities undertaken by the social workers was of a bureaucratic nature, both on an individual level (the bulk of daily activity was spent online completing digital forms) and as a group (meetings to discuss resourcing, staff training, etc.). While this is not to say that there were no valuable observations in such activities - indeed, the apparent dichotomy between the interactions of supervisors and clients, and the wider professional context of social work would itself be a worthwhile subject - such material proved to be beyond the scope of this particular exploration of supervisor/client interaction. Secondly, from an instrumental perspective, such observations provided tenuous material with regards to my research interests in the participating social workers with regards to their interactions with clients.

Further, it may be argued that this research leans more towards the supervisors' perspectives than the clients. Although every effort was made to provide clients with the opportunity to express themselves, and full observational attention was given to their contributions and involvement in meetings, the inherent nature of the field weighted research attention towards supervisors. As a researcher, I could remain attached to supervisors

throughout the day, and even if I wasn't observing their wider professional behaviour, I had the opportunity to engage in ongoing discussions, ask questions, and observe any calls they made with or on behalf of consenting clients. Clients, on the other hand, I could not remain attached to following their meetings, and opportunities to discuss matters with them were slimmer - the hectic nature of most clients' lives meant post-meeting discussions were difficult to schedule (and independently scheduled interviews proved impossible). Clients would either have pre-existing commitments, or in cases where discussions were agreed for after the next supervision meeting, would have forgotten and likewise made plans, or have to cancel at the last minute because of some emergency, or a simple lack of inclination.

This is not to say that the research failed to develop an understanding of clients' perspectives, how their involvement shaped the interactions and social realities of unpaid work, or its consequences for them as a CPO stakeholder. But from a comparative perspective, insights into the nature of the supervisor were undoubtedly more abundant and nuanced.

In terms of the meetings themselves, challenges were also faced with regards to the nature of 'participation'. Simply put, while I strove to be approachable and respectful with both parties, in actual meetings I endeavoured to withhold any contribution. I am not a trained social worker and did not want to disrupt what was a sensitive, personal and often delicate process - not only for the sake of authentic observation, but out of an ethical commitment to avoid causing harm or complication to clients' rehabilitative work. Thus I adopted what might be dubbed 'non-interventative participation': I would greet clients warmly before the interview began (although even here I took care not to overstep - even the question 'how are you doing?', as will be seen, proved to be an important tool in meetings) - and would otherwise make myself as inconspicuous as possible. By seating myself in a corner out of a client's eyeline, and minimising the noise I produced, it appeared to achieve a sense that these were meetings like any other. The supervisors to which I was attached also proved immensely helpful in explaining my

presence whenever I met with a new client, conveying critical information I had provided them with concerning my presence, role, safeguards and limitations.

However there were, of course, instances in which this approach did not succeed. On the one hand, there were meetings where even clients with whom I had a well-established rapport through post-meeting discussions did not want me sitting in due to sensitive topics being discussed. This was of course their right and I acceded sympathetically. On the other hand, though, there were instances in the middle of meetings where clients would turn to me and ask for my perspective - what did I think, as a supposed expert on criminal justice, about a particular court decision, or whether I had ever had a girlfriend whom I thought had behaved unreasonably. In such instances, I attempted to provide a neutral non-answer that would quickly close my involvement, and did not support or refute either the client's or the supervisor's position. "I'm afraid I don't really know much about that part of the law" or "I've always been lucky in my relationships" were some such examples.

Moving on to the subsequent case study into unpaid work, this involved my attachment to three weekly unpaid work teams. The precise membership of these teams, both for clients and to a lesser extent unpaid work managers and organisational beneficiaries, changed from week to week. The sites, however, remained relatively consistent: the vast majority of the teams' time was spent at either Argyll or Montrose Parks, both privately-owned but publicly-available green spaces within the city, with some additional work being undertaken at a local workshop used by the unpaid work staff to produce goods such as picnic tables, or the 'charity shop run' (a day spent conveying goods between local stores). During these 9am to 3pm shifts, I worked alongside clients at whatever task to which they had been assigned. The intent was not to derive any auto-ethnographic insight into the nature of the work we undertook, but simply as a means of quickly and effectively building rapport through 'participation' - by working directly (and

literally) alongside clients, I was not only privy to their own interactions, but paid my dues to be considered a part of their group, thus making them more open to questions I had.

It is important to note that, as with the supervision case study, it may be said that my unpaid work case study does have its own leaning in terms of findings. However, in this case, that lean is inverted: due to the necessity of putting in my own effort alongside clients for full shifts, and thus only observing organisational beneficiaries in moments of interaction, my findings display a greater nuance for clients' perspectives and experiences.

The major obstacle during unpaid work observation was the totality of the setting. Whereas in supervision I could occupy an unseen space in order to take field notes in real-time, unpaid work not only necessitated my time and attention to physically undertake tasks, but by being entrenched alongside clients I was not free to readily take notes. Breaking from the work to write observations down would have been doubly harmful: firstly, I did not want to be seen as 'slacking off' from my share of the task, especially to do something as non-contributive and gentle as writing in a notebook; secondly, I did not want clients to feel so directly observed - while they knew the purpose of my presence amongst them, making conspicuous notes after some comment or activity would have made it explicit, and risked generating an uncomfortably sense of scrutiny that may have impacted participants' interactions.

Thus I would make use of momentary breaks or lulls in work to find an unobtrusive location to briefly note key reminders and points. Lunch breaks and the end of shifts would then serve as an opportunity to fully annotate, respectively, the morning and afternoon segments of the day. But this itself presented a compounding challenge: so as not to appear anti-social, or to miss any key comments or interactions, I would conduct this annotation with the client team nearby. Although I explained (with an attempted injection of humour) that this was simply a general summary of the morning's work, and not a running transcription of their lunch, this in turn invited sincere curiosity

as to what parts of the morning I had found interesting. This presented the challenge: on the one hand, from an ethical and personal standpoint it was important for me to share my work with those who were making it possible, but on the other I still wanted to avoid creating any sense that clients' activities were under a microscope of scrutiny. My responses were thus general in scope, avoiding specifics while nonetheless conveying emergent themes and ideas I was trying to understand - the nature of certain tasks versus others, the importance of group mood, how well tasks had been explained. As a result, such moments occasionally offered opportunities for me to gain further insights from clients as to their perspectives on these concepts, encouraging greater participation, rather than a withdrawal therefrom.

Stepping back to critique my fieldwork as a whole, there are two final points worth discussing. The first is, perhaps, premature in that it pertains to the findings of my fieldwork before those findings have actually been presented. Nonetheless, it is important to acknowledge at the outset that these findings are predominantly positive. This was not a deliberate aspect of the research design - this project does not ascribe to an appreciative inquiry model, or any similar approach - but nonetheless, upon reflection, it would seem that it is a consequence of the research design. Given the ontological and epistemological facets of this research, and how they informed its questions and methodology, my purpose was to develop an understanding of how research participants perceived themselves, each other, and how their interactions as a result constituted the CPO in practice. The predominant positivity of my findings can be directly tied to this effort because participant perceptions - the building-blocks of the CPO's social realities (and my findings) - were predominantly positive. Certainly, there were instances of clients who were reluctant to participate in supervision, or who experienced moments of resentment in unpaid work, and those are given the acknowledgement and analysis they deserve, but they were exceptional. In general, the narratives I encountered in these observations were ones of

effort and attempt: supervisors trying to help realise meaningful change, beneficiaries trying to create a welcoming and supportive environment, clients sincerely trying to transform their lives and work towards desistance. From an analytical perspective, comparing aspects of these findings to established research and theory, there were still aspects that needed challenging or concerns to be raised, but as will become increasingly apparent in my linkage between findings and literature, the most recurrent and important theme became one question. If the CPO's social reality, as I observed it, was so positive, so defined by its stakeholders attempting to achieve something positive, why didn't it work? Why were clients continuing to struggle to realise the changes they had discussed with their supervisors, and which they were motivated to realise? Why didn't unpaid work have a material impact on clients' lives? The answers to these questions are for later discussion, but they nevertheless serve to illustrate that the positivity found in these findings is not the result of uncritical acceptance of the field studied, but rather a continuation of this research's explorative ethos. Namely, how this positivity fits into a wider dichotomy observed in the CPO's same social realities.

The final point that requires discussion is the use of the term 'client' from this point forth. 'Offender' has been used in the literature discussion so far to reflect the predominant vocabulary of the works cited, whereas 'client' is used in the discussion of findings to reflect the official term used by social workers and beneficiaries. There is, certainly, an argument to be made that 'client' is a euphemism that sanitises and obfuscates the enforced, penal nature of the CPO. But to call them 'offenders' is to likewise adopt a term loaded with meanings - ones that do, indeed, acknowledge the penalty of their context, but also define these individuals in relation to their wrongdoing. Given the nature of the interactions observed, which focussed more on humanising, supportive treatment than punishment or restraint, 'client' was deemed the more appropriate term as an accurate reflection of the perceptions and meanings operant within the CPO as observed.

Research, Analysis and My Self

It has already been stressed at numerous points throughout this thesis that my primary concern with this research has been to develop an understanding of participants' perceptions in as close to their own terms as possible, absent significant biases or presumptions. However, I have also acknowledged in the introductory chapter that I am no exception to the ontological principles which underpin this research: my own perceptual framework is a positional factor in the interpretation and analysis of research data which must be acknowledged. This is a consideration which goes deeper the external identity I presented to research participants, and instead touches upon my private self that has handled, scrutinised and evaluated the findings of this research.

Let us start, then, with the fundamental aspects of my self. I identify as a male, and was assigned as such at birth; I am homosexual, and have been in a committed, stable and monogamous relationship for almost a decade; I was raised in a comfortably middle class household; over the course of this research I passed from my mid- to late-twenties; and while I am a measurable distance from being in good physical shape, I do not consider it denial to say that what I lack in fitness I make up for with stubborn determination.

I do not consider any of these factors to have influenced the analysis of my data - such influences came from my own normativity, which will be discussed next. I am, however, the first to acknowledge their influence on my data gathering; how I engaged with the field and its participants. Some of this influence is undoubtedly obvious, even before my research findings are read: as a child of middle class upbringing, my understanding of social deprivation, inequality and injustice is entirely remote, contained wholly within an academic understanding of criminogenesis, and a wider social consciousness of how wealth and power are inequitably distributed. Indeed,

my own personal experience of crime is as a past victim of assault, both conventional and homophobically-motivated. I do not share the lived experiences of the many clients I have observed and interviewed, which is the primary reason why, throughout the remainder of this research, my own voice is silent. Encountering individual clients' histories of abuse or neglect, listening to struggles with substance misuse or anger management, and watching them endeavour to improve their lives in environments that were far from conducive to change - I would be lying if I said I was not personally impacted. But my shock, sadness, and vicarious sense of injustice adds nothing to their accounts, and indeed only detracts by stealing the focus that is rightfully theirs. What I have believed I can meaningfully add is my academic capacity to contextualise their experiences within wider criminological theories, or prior research findings.

In terms of data gathering, as already mentioned in the research identity I presented during fieldwork, I attempted to negotiate this experiential gulf by investing clients, indeed all participants, with a portion of my power as a researcher. I endeavoured not to approach them with either judgement or pity, treating them in either regard as some assumed object, but stepped back and offered them the space to be subject - to tell their stories in their words, and respect those accounts by treating them as they sought to be treated. I was profoundly aware that my experience would leave me stumbling over preconceptions I didn't even know existed, and so chose to check my own position and look to my participants as guides to empathic understanding - an approach to which ethnographic interviewing was fortunately well suited.

This had the advantage of sidestepping other factors of my self, such as my gender and age, which only deepened the experiential gulf with certain participants. Indeed, my sexuality proved to be the most significant challenge in my approach to data gathering, and for entirely my own reasons. Out of a concern, misplaced or otherwise I'll never know, that knowledge of my sexuality might provoke opprobrium, discomfort, or some other relational

dynamic that would interfere with my research, I chose to keep this aspect of myself secret. When discussions of relationships arose, and my involvement in such discussions was engaged, I kept my responses (and pronouns) vague, and was always quick to deflect the discussion away from me.

In terms of my physicality, I feel confident in saying that it did not inhibit my ability to engage with participants in unpaid work. Again, my own voice in such sections is silent because of the same experiential gulf: my perspective on unpaid work is as a constellation of criminological theories on community sentencing, not as a punishment imposed for my behaviour. While I experienced parallels of many of the same morale states as clients - concepts found later in this thesis such as 'graft' or 'meaningful work' - I was approaching those states from a wholly different starting point. I was, in essence, a tourist, participating voluntarily as a means of spectating an involuntary imposition, and to have included my own experiences of such would have carried an old, unpleasantly colonial reek. Nonetheless, my determination to match clients' efforts step-for-step did cement a strong informal access amongst unpaid work groups; I pulled my weight (and as I often joked, my weight was more than most) and in so doing was welcomed into the collectives that formed.

Moving beyond the fundamental characteristics that influence my self and my perspective, there is also my normative framework to discuss. This is likely to already be apparent from this thesis' literature review, and will certainly be so from the discussions that follow in the findings chapters. To reserve this discussion to criminological norms, I consider myself a strong proponent of rehabilitative practice. It is my belief that criminal justice disposals best serve all parties - offenders, victims, and society at large - by seeking to address the underlying problems that contribute to criminogenesis, and provide a supportive process to clients who seek to achieve long-term change in their lives. Thus, throughout this thesis, I have sought to highlight (and, crucially, substantiate with reference to established theory and research) aspects of my findings that support such an approach

to community sentencing, and wider criminal justice. However, I have also endeavoured to counter-balance my own normative support of rehabilitation with a recognition of its dangers, problems and challenges, emphasising such critiques in my findings where they are warranted.

Commensurate to my support of rehabilitation, I am critical of punishment as a retributivist tool, and a symbolic opportunity to satisfy populist punitive appetites. While much of this research's findings seem to share this criticality, I found myself over the course of analysis coming to challenge my own position. More a product of my efforts to counter-balance my support of rehabilitation, one of my significant findings at the conclusion of this thesis ultimately argues in favour of a recognition of the CPO as a punishment, in order to encourage a greater self-awareness amongst supervisors and beneficiaries of the power dynamics they exist within.

Finally, and perhaps moving on to a more meta-normative level, this research has been influenced by a strong belief in practicability - that is to say, I believe that criminology exists to influence and shape criminal justice, rather than merely to analyse it. This has meant that at numerous points throughout the thesis I have engaged in ongoing debate, both within criminology and the wider justice sector, and sought to attribute my findings in support or against certain trends. For example, I consider desistance theory to be a positive development in current Scottish policy, albeit this has not stopped me from highlighting several issues present in this research's findings of the challenges that emerge from a partial, unsupported application of this theory. I would stress that at no stage of my research has this effort undermined the objectivity of my data-gathering or the findings themselves, nor has it motivated me to approach analysis with any less rigour or criticality, but nonetheless I openly acknowledge this project to be part of a professional enterprise to contribute towards a criminal justice system that I believe to be more enlightened.

Structuring Notes and Analysis

The prospect of two extended, in-depth, explorative observational studies necessitated a degree of structuring to ensure sufficient data control and focus, and in turn a more meaningful analysis thereof. As usual, the challenge in establishing such a structure was to balance openness to data with a means of ensuring it did not succumb to meaningless amorphism. In my ontology, I had opted for a series of fundamental assumptions and assertions as to the nature of reality and interaction, which I hoped would achieve such a balance; here too, I made explicit a set of basic assumptions that would provide a necessary structure to my findings without disproportionately inhibiting my data-gathering and -analysis.

At the initial level of writing observational notes, Emerson et al.'s structuring of analytical features [2011] provided a thorough and structured means of breaking down observations into their key components, many of which paralleled the project's research questions:

- *Activities and Objectives* - A description of participants' actions and interactions, along with their avowed intents or aims in so doing.
- *Means and Methods* - A breakdown of the steps and processes by which these actions/interactions are achieved.
- *Interpretations* - The subjective meanings by which participants characterise and interpret contexts, events and behaviours.
- *Research Relevance* - A provisional explanation as to the inclusion of this observation, bridging what was seen with what might be learned from it, and what further data would be required to verify or disprove this.

This final category in particular was useful for my own self-management as the project's primary research instrument, requiring me to scrutinise and confront my assumptions not on a broad and vague level, but integrating a core element of reflexivity into each and every observation

[Cosgrove and Francis, 2011].

My approach to note-taking was not static, but developmental and tiered. Each set of daily field-notes would conclude with a provisional attempt to summarise and explicate its contents (along with the aforementioned critical reflexivity, and a consideration of what I would need to prove or disprove this conclusion). These would, in turn, inform weekly summaries detailing potentially conflicting or corroborating content, and then subsequent monthly summaries. These would not be used in post-research data analysis - even on a weekly level, they were too generalised - but as a means of constantly testing and developing my observational focus and notes to ensure a balanced approach between openness and strategic examination.

Following the completion of fieldwork, there remained the final analytical task of translating the project's findings on participant interaction into an examination of the consequent intersubjective realities. The analytical toolkit provided by discourse analysis proved best suited for this task, concerned as it is with examining the contexts and dynamics for the means by which participants express particular perspectives and seek to achieve particular ends within a given situation [Chamberlain, 2013]. These analytical methods were readily adaptable for the project's objectives, questions and ontological underpinnings: the methods' emphasis upon simultaneously understanding the context - both linguistic and situational - of communication, and the notion of the 'interpretive repertoire' by which participants use communicative resources to portray phenomena in a particular manner, provided a useful means of generating insight into the interactive dynamics between stakeholders [Nunan, 1993]. Furthermore, how this contextualisation and repertoire-usage was sequenced within the occurrence of interaction - how one party chose to respond to the expressions of the other, and how the wider context (i.e. the CPO) was made individually relevant or subverted [Potter, 2009] - was ideal for dissecting the mechanisms by which intersubjective realities were collaboratively constructed, imposed or otherwise tentatively achieved.

This discourse toolkit therefore served as the next stage of data handling and interpretation. This involved a close reading of my field-notes and interview transcripts in order to analyse which discourse elements were relevant, and what significance they produced when applied to observations and interview responses.

The final step of the core analytical effort was codifying the resultant findings into a clear and streamlined series of points. Utilising Boyatzis' model of thematic codification [1998], I examined the key determinants of participants' perceptions that contributed to resultant intersubjective realities and grouped common facets into individual 'themes' which was then given a constituting description that could identify, qualify and distinguish that theme from the rest of the data. With a now two-tiered collection of notes covering both observations and a discourse analysis thereof, a series of readings developed an initial, wide range of themes emergent across the findings. These initial themes were critiqued for clarity (did it have a defined criteria for application), relevancy (did said criteria generate a meaningful/valuable connection or context between data), and applicability (could said criteria be grounded in sufficient explicit examples), and edited accordingly through a final reading. Next, these finalised themes were combined as instance of more nuanced, umbrella concepts with shared characteristics, which in turn were grouped into broader categories for effective understanding and discussion. The result is found in the very structuring of this thesis: the broad categories serve as the findings chapters; the umbrella concepts are the individual parts within those chapters; and the finalised themes serve as discussion points for the findings.

Given the nature of the project's context - both the CPO and the interactive focus of the participants - these themes do still demonstrate, if not explicit overlap, distinct points of connection between each other, but even in these instances one theme would have a clear 'jurisdiction' over a particular observational or analytical facet.

Alongside the core, inherent analysis of the research's findings came a

simultaneous comparison of those findings against the theory and research of the project's wider literature context. As mentioned at the outset of this chapter, and indicated throughout the project's design, the emphasis on pursuing an open research perspective with limited preconceptions and assumptions required a reconceptualisation of the literature review. A conventional project typically ensures its research and findings possess a relevancy to broader discourses by deriving its questions from ongoing theoretical or research-based issues, challenges or gaps. However, in this particular project, with the exception of the CPO as a largely-unresearched gap in criminological discourse, the intent is not to derive questions from the wider literature discourse, but instead generate relevancy by comparing and contrasting its findings and their analyses against relevant theories and research. Thus the establishment of a set of spectra within the research literature, constructed around the three sub-questions of rationale, process and significance that have been present in prior research pertaining to supervision/probation and unpaid work/community service. In this sense, while the project is predominantly a data-driven analytical/codifying process [Boyatzis, 1998], it does borrow the notion of utilising literature as a set of 'sensitising concepts'. That is to say, it utilises the wider literature to simultaneously generate a second strata of wider, contextual analysis of the project's findings, as well as place the project within a continuum of prior theory and/or research, either indicating a meaningful continuation of established research themes and discourse, or a noteworthy distinction therefrom.

Representation of Data in the Thesis

In the subsequent chapters that constitute this thesis' discussion of research findings, I have taken a particular approach to representing my fieldwork observations. As an observational researcher, illustrating and substantiating my findings is not as simple and objective as presenting

interview transcripts - although short segments of my interviews with participants are also used where appropriate. Instead, I am required to rely upon anecdote, recounting my experiences and analyses of fieldwork in order to highlight whatever crucial point I am endeavouring to make.

In order to achieve this, I have constructed small, standalone narratives from the content of my fieldwork notes and their ongoing analysis. The primary content of these narratives is directly taken from my notes - participants' perceptions, actions, interactions and the observable consequences thereof - however, due to the representative nature of these narratives, two notable aspects must be highlighted for the sake of transparency.

The first is the fact that each of these narratives is written to highlight one particular theme or aspect of my research's findings. It is thus intended to represent one single concept, but obviously the actual observed event may have contained a multiplicity of contributions to a range of different themes and aspects. In constructing the narrative to represent only one such focal theme, I have endeavoured to select examples where that theme is indeed the priority or primary focus of the event, and in all instances that my representation has not resulted in a reconstruction to better suit my research. That is to say, I have also included such contextual information about the observed event as I have judged to be necessary, so that readers understand from whence the theme or aspect emerged within a naturalistic environment, and thus its relative importance.

Secondly, and consequently, this means that I have been required to draw upon a range of my observational notes in order to present a coherent, contextual picture. These representative narratives, as already stated, also draw upon participants' perceptions, which may have been substantiated through discussions either before or after the event in question, and the consequences or other such outcomes of the interaction, which by necessity can only be observed afterwards. Additionally, as already discussed in the prior section of this chapter, the nature of analysis is iterative and

developmental; the full significance of actions observed during a particular event are typically only understood after subsequent consideration, including in relation to other prior or subsequent observed activities. Thus, while the central constituting element of these narratives are the observations made during direct fieldwork, not all of them are immediate, and the interpretations that give these observations meaning are the product of such ongoing analysis.

As a result, readers are encouraged not to treat these narratives as pure excerpts from my observational field notes, but rather representations of the situations observed, constructed by bringing together such notes, and refining them with analysis.

An Epistemological Endnote

Interpretation is an inescapable issue when it comes to qualitative research. As Stake notes [1995], it is not a simple process of identifying and measuring variables to allow for a superficial description and mechanical analysis of the field and its focal facets. Observation, questioning, recording, analysis of meaning and even researcher responsivity are all both deeply intermingled and interpretive. This is doubly so for a project such as this, with its central focus on understanding the meanings and perceptions that drive participants' actions, the dynamics of their inter-actions and the resultant intersubjective realities thereby produced. In Schwandt's terms [2000, p201], 'to find meaning in an action, or to say one understands what a particular action means, requires that one interpret in a particular way what the actors are doing'.

As a predominantly observation-driven project, in order to move past the most basic reportage of what participants say or do, and actually move into the realm of meaningful analysis, it is unavoidable that interpretive claims are made. Through my ongoing observation and participation in the field, I as the researcher can ascribe greater meaning to behaviour: what meanings

underlie actions, and the functions and consequent realities of interaction.

However, this raises one of the most pressing epistemological issues with observation as a method of gathering and analysing data: how can an observer assume their experience of the field and its participants matches those of the participants themselves? This project attempts to address that issue by recognising that the researcher is not the only interpretive individual in play within the setting; the very knowledge sought by this project has its roots in participants generating and acting upon meanings they construct fluidly, contextually and in negotiation with others [Mason, 2002]. Indeed, this research's ontological foundation is built upon the argument that communication is an attempt to share the very meanings sought by this research. As a result, in attempting to understand the meanings surrounding stakeholders' actions and interactions, the effort during the research's initial stage was to align the research's own meanings with those of the participants. This undoubtedly required an even greater emphasis on self-reflective practice, and self-control in analysis, but places greater importance on reaching out to the participants to assist in understanding their perspectives. Rather than flatly claim the epistemological privilege of researcher - that I understand the participants because I have observed them - my understanding of their actions and underlying meanings comes from a marriage of said observation, but also a direct, ethnographic effort to have them explain themselves to me. This does not, however, pass the same privilege onto participants, providing them *carte blanche* to claim whatever they want as their perspectives, because I have retained sufficient interpretation to note where inconsistencies between such claims and observed behaviour arise. Knowledge derived from interviews, after all, carries its own validity risks, taking place as it does within a detached, abstracted context where post-hoc rationalisation, generalisation and subtle bias can influence responses [Kvale and Brinkman, 2009]. This has allowed me to maintain the key epistemological aim of observation - namely, that valuable, naturalistic data can be generated through observing everyday

behaviour (much of which a participant might not be able to recount, articulate or construct in an interview) - but ensure such observations are informed, grounded and sometimes guided by an ongoing self-account by participants of their own perspective.

Chapter 5 - Developing and Harnessing Client Understanding

It was clear, from the very outset of my research into the supervision requirement, that the first priority of supervisors in their interactions was to build and utilise an understanding of the client. More than simply a basic requirement for supervision to function - identifying criminogenic problems clients faced, or pro-social assets that could be developed - the process of seeking from clients their own perspective on their lives was an integral part to supervision, laying the groundwork for engaging them in subsequent motivation-building and problem-solving.

For this reason, 'understanding' became the gateway to exploring how supervisor/client interactions shaped supervision because it was, in the CPO's own practice, the means by which the supervision requirement was initialised and progressed between the two stakeholders. From the core concept of 'getting to know' a client, that would act as the dynamo to drive the bulk of supervision, to the relationship of 'rapport' that needed to be developed in order to achieve that state, with all its attendant difficulties, the ways in which the stakeholders interacted in pursuit of the supervisor's understanding of their client was profoundly influential.

Part 1 - 'Getting to Know' the Client

It was the first client supervision meeting I sat in on as an observer. Martin, the client, was meeting with his supervisor, Morgan, to discuss a group-work programme he had recently completed: what had he learned, and what problems did he want help addressing as a result. Morgan clearly wanted this to be a conversation - their questions were open, and even the shortest of answers from Martin were met with verbal encouragement, not only concerning his answering but the 'good work' he'd done as part of the programme. But Martin was reluctant to discuss his experiences of the group-work or his

problems, and the shortest of answers were all he gave; when asked if he had learned anything useful from the group-work, he replied with what was already becoming a trademark short simplicity: "don't get lifted, don't buy drugs". Ultimately, the meeting was less a conversation and more a truncated interview: questions were met with answers, but none catalysed a discussion that moved the subject matter forward. While Martin acknowledged he had a problem with alcohol, he gave the impression that he believed he had it 'under control', shutting down both attempts to understand what he meant by that, as well as efforts to provide further support or help. Ultimately, Morgan left the meeting unsatisfied, expressing to me in private that a change in approach was needed. Martin wouldn't engage with supervision as long as it was presented to him as a matter of problems and solutions; they would have to 'get to know' Martin.

From the very start of my observations with Morgan, which doubled as the start of my fieldwork as a whole for both the supervision requirement and the CPO in its entirety, this concept of 'getting to know' a client was integral to supervision. While Morgan had extensive documentation listing their clients' standardised criminogenic problems, the long-term operation of supervision could not succeed without 'getting to know' their clients. Understanding a client was not simply a matter of identifying the problems they faced, both on a day-to-day and lifestyle level - alcoholism, anger management, employment, housing - because Morgan and other supervisors already knew about those problems. Understanding relied upon the client 'opening up' - offering the deeper, more detailed information on their lives that a case file couldn't offer, in essence guiding the supervisor's support for them via in-depth discussion led by the client. While Martin's own 'opening up' is worth later examination, the means by which Morgan endeavoured to achieve this with him and other clients is telling: at the most basic level, asking questions catalysed a response, which was developed by prompts, follow-ups and

encouragement to stimulate less a back-and-forth, question-and-answer dynamic and more a naturalistic conversation, if not an extended insight from clients. This allowed clients to generate both entire topics and specific details that, in turn, allowed their supervisors to generate an individualised response to address problems clients had identified or support assets they saw in their lives. 'Getting to know' a client was more than just gaining information, but establishing an ongoing dynamic of interaction whereby the client was willing to offer that information freely, indeed eagerly. Supportive intervention remained the goal, but the means by which this was achieved placed the supervisor in a secondary, facilitative position - not only with regards to providing support, but in helping clients identify and describe their own problems and assets too.

In this regard, Martin was indicative of the few clients who proved a challenge in 'getting to know' them. He was deflective, resisting efforts to develop a deeper and more personal understanding of his life by focussing on basic facts and generic statements. His description of how frequently he drank, or broad claims that he 'loved his kids', offered little for Morgan to carry on, let alone deepen, the conversation. Right from the start, it was clear that the interactions between supervisor and client relied upon the latter. The interactions themselves were structured to engage, in a supportive and interested fashion, the client in a free-form provision of information, which not only established the objectives for future meetings, but their very vocabulary for those meetings. A reticent client like Martin left any attempt to provide help or support impractically generic; standardised responses to a standardised understanding of the client's life.

When less reticent clients were offered the opportunity to share their perspectives on their own lives, they were, unsurprisingly, more eager to discuss day-to-day problems they were facing rather than dive into an in-depth examination of their criminogenic risk factors and pro-social assets. But even this - especially this - was a critical component of 'getting to know' the client; both supervisors I observed, Morgan and Riley, would ask at the

start of every meeting with their clients some variation on 'how're you doing?', 'how've you been since we last met?', 'how was your week?'. It demonstrated an interest that went beyond the professional, and acted as a friendly, concerned (and, importantly, open) invitation for the client to take the floor and share whatever was troubling them, or on rare occasions a positive development of which they felt proud for achieving. These practical, day-to-day problems then became the agenda for a considerable portion of every meeting, with the clients' crises, dramas and complaints generating a series of talking points that gave the supervisors an opportunity to start understanding, and engaging with them, on a deeper level. The process of the interaction followed the same client-centric and -driven stimulation pattern as discussed above: Morgan and Riley would both encourage clients to explain their problem(s) in their own words, and offer open-ended prompts for the clients to furnish them with any further pertinent information. They would listen actively, demonstrating interest and concern without interrupting the client, occasionally making a comment that sympathised with the client's issue and placed them in a position of compassion and soft agreement to encourage clients to continue. In response to this, clients were more than willing to enter into lengthy, emotive detail about their problems, how these tied into their lives in general, how they made them feel and their concerns about future problems their problems might cause; the fact that they had a sympathetic, non-judgemental, confidential listener to whom they could vent their angers and worries was often all the encouragement they needed.

This centrality of the client's own perspective in supervision interactions has interesting implications when considered in relation to the wider literature. McCulloch's research [2005], for instance, has clear parallels: the focus on discussing wider life and social problems as a means of reducing further offending, particularly discussion that emphasises the development of solutions to problems raised during meetings. But more importantly it demonstrates the relevancy and significance of the client 'being listened to' [p15]; more than simply a means of encouraging greater client

engagement, client involvement improves the level of understanding present in the probation interaction and hones the efficacy of advice, guidance or other solutions presented as a result. What this seems to demonstrate is that the rationales of normative engagement and pragmatic assistance are, at least when it comes to the notion of developing and harnessing an understanding of the client, not just conveniently hybridised but inextricably linked: engaging a client to the extent that they are willing to share their self-perspective leads not only to their own motivation to address problems and pursue constructive change, but creates a body of information that allows practical means of assistance to be individualised and specialised to assist them in that process. That being said, the fact that McCulloch's research was the latest in a line of studies [Farrall, 2002; McIvor and Barry, 1998; McNeill, 1998; Maguire et al., 1998] to question the ability of probation interaction to achieve that change without also addressing underlying social criminogenic factors and obstacles is a matter that will be an ongoing limitation and difficulty addressed in these findings, undermining the long-term effectiveness of otherwise positive supervision efforts and, as a result, the CPO as a whole.

One of Morgan's clients, Luke, came into a meeting agitated and upset. When, as a variation on his standard opening, Morgan asked him what's wrong, Luke launched into an extensive explanation about how, supposedly as a means to sabotage his attempts at greater visitation rights, his ex-partner had begun spreading spurious rumours about him to their mutual friends. Agreeing with him that this was both deceptive and potentially dangerous misbehaviour, Morgan encouraged Luke to explain why this had agitated him, and at length Luke raised three issues: he was concerned the rumours would get him fired from his part-time job, he felt afraid for his safety in his neighbourhood if certain residents heard those rumours, and he was angry at his ex-partner for spreading them in the first place. Based on

Luke's perspective regarding his problem, and the values he was demonstrating (protecting his employment, concern for his own wellbeing, and desire to see his children conflicting with hostility to his ex-partner), Morgan dedicated the rest of the meeting to discussing several practical solutions - calling his work to explain the situation and discussing the matter with his friends and neighbours - as well as working through some deeper intervention concerning how Luke approached conflict resolution, engaging Luke's interest and involvement by explaining how he could avoid altercations with either his ex-partner or dangerous elements in his neighbourhood that might lead to either a run-in with the police, physical harm to himself, or compromising his efforts at greater visitation rights.

From this free expression, Morgan was furnished not only with the practical, surface details of his client's problems, but Luke's perspectives on those problems: how the client perceived the situation and, importantly, what values they based that perception on. By constructing the interaction to allow Luke to share his perspective, Morgan was able to 'get to know' him better - his pressing concerns about protecting his employment, his sense of safety in his neighbourhood, and the strength and nature of his emotions regarding his family. This, in turn, set the terms of how Morgan would respond; and while that response was still based on Morgan's own professional imperatives of ensuring Luke remain law-abiding, safe and working towards desistance from offending, precisely how those imperatives were achieved were all based on an individualised, in-depth understanding of Luke gleaned from his own account of the situation.

This also demonstrates the client-centric nature of how Morgan and Riley responded to clients based on this 'getting to know' them model. Clients were not merely given an open forum to express their concerns, only to immediately encounter a bottleneck in the form of their supervisor dictating how they should respond; instead, Morgan and Riley offered suggestions,

made relevant and applicable by the specific details already offered, and honed even further into an achievable, desirable course of action for the client by further discussion. While there was often a clear dynamic in such situations of the client bringing a problem to their supervisor looking for a solution to be provided and/or some form of help to be rendered, that supervisor response was determined by consensus. Nevertheless, Morgan and Riley were clearly limited by the aforementioned professional priorities: any response they suggested, and any consensus developed with their clients, had to minimise risk of reoffending and have at least the potential of the client achieving some desistance-pertinent development.

This, however did not seem to mar what many clients saw as one of the key strengths of supervision. As several of my discussions with clients highlighted, they appreciated not only the sense that they could bring any issue to Morgan or Riley, but in raising that issue they "valued what [they] had to say" - their supervisors conveyed not only a sense of care and support, but the fact they took onboard clients' own concerns and priorities resulted in greater client motivation to work with their supervisors in developing, and acting upon, solutions to the problems they raised.

While the professional context of supervision set forth an explicit public protection agenda for supervisors, and office documentation operated on a standardised risk-assessment form for clients, this practical emphasis on face-to-face, interpersonal interaction crucially succeeded in side-stepping many of the 'technist' risks that might otherwise have arisen from such a context [Kemshall, 2010]. Far from being restrained by a single, 'objective' assessment of their issues, clients had a predominantly free space within a dynamic interaction process to shape how they were understood in person, and it was that process, rather than the more distant, actuarialised variant found in office documentation, that influenced Morgan and Riley in pursuing interventions (who treated such documentation and its assessment as a post-interaction bureaucratic requisite, as opposed to a necessary blueprint model for client engagement/intervention). Even generic external programmes were

given considerable effort to 'fit' with clients, with their broad remits discussed with regards to specific challenges or aspirations relevant to the client in question. In contrast with 'new rehabilitation' and the potential reframing of rehabilitation as 'responsibilisation' solely for the sake of public protection via crime reduction, this relationship remained grounded in a humanitarian effort and dynamic [Robinson and McNeill, 2017].

Indeed, clients' actual offending behaviour that brought about their sentence received comparatively little significance in officers' efforts to develop an understanding of them, and at no point did officers express any perception that the offender was present in supervision to 'make good' on their offending [McNeill and Whyte, 2007]. Rather, clients were endeavoured to be understood in their own terms, and as complex individuals whose behaviour arose from societal challenges, and who were in turn responded to with support in order to tackle those challenges, rather than an imposed, simplistic moral obligation to change their wrongdoing. Even clients did not dwell on supervision's nature as a punishment, or the degree to which they deserved to receive such a punishment; behavioural change was pursued with minimal, if any, reference to past wrongdoing, and indeed contextual factors influencing criminogenesis were a major focus of engaged, motivated discussions, rather than the means for partially-engaged clients to deflect personal responsibility [Hayes, 2015].

It was the fourth meeting I'd observed between Morgan and Keith, a client who had proven reluctant to engage with the standard 'how are things?' opening - while he would talk at length about an ongoing housing issue he and his parents were facing, much like Martin he shared little in the way of personal details, or his own perception of the situation, keeping instead to practical aspects like court hearing dates and the legal grounds for their eviction. So at the fourth meeting, Morgan took a different approach: they presented Keith with a simple exercise sheet, listing some typical reasons for offending, and

together the pair talked through each reason to explore whether it was relevant to Keith, and if so how. One particular reason - the thrill of offending - lead to a remarkable opening up from Keith, who went on a lengthy, deeply personal explanation of his behaviour and its consequences: how breaking into houses (the offence for which he received his CPO) made him feel skilled at something, earned him the respect of his crew. Morgan asked whether he still felt this way, and Keith admitted he wasn't sure: on the one hand, he didn't know what else he was good at, but on the other he hesitantly confessed to a deep sense of guilt, since he believed it was his offending that had resulted in eviction proceedings being initiated against his family.

This was just one question out of a dozen that Morgan and Keith worked through over the course of that meeting. For some of the standardised reasons for offending, Keith didn't consider them relevant - he wasn't simply nodding his head and going along with the process - but when he did see something comparable to his own experiences, his own self-perception, he discussed it at length with only minimal non-verbal prompting from Morgan (nods, sympathetic smiles, wordless sounds of empathy and encouragement). The work sheet was generic, but Keith's engagement made it pertinent to his own life, feelings and challenges, and in doing so generated the content of his future meetings with Morgan: signing up for an outdoors skills-development course organised over the following weeks, Morgan writing a supervisor's statement and phoning the city council on Keith's behalf to discuss cancelling the eviction, and ongoing discussions to support Keith's involvement with his peers (particularly his struggle not to be pressured into further offending by them). So while, yes, Morgan did take what their client had to say onboard, valuing it both personally in a sympathetic and non-judgemental manner as well as on a professional level in using it to set the supervision agenda, the real heart of supervision was the client's willingness to share their own understanding: of their lives, their challenges, their assets

and even themselves. Not only did this identify the problems they face, but also contained the foundations of how their supervisors worked with them to develop a solution.

This understanding-driven solution approach has a particular and essential distinction to be made when considered in light of Harrison's critique [2006] of contemporary rehabilitative practice, particularly cognitive behaviouralism. While at first the supervisory process of drawing upon the client's perspective to identify key facets in need of addressing is comparable to the system of situation-recognition and self-policing techniques Harrison decries as ineffective, unjust and criminogenically myopic, supervision's process of client understanding-driven pragmatic assistance has a more agentic depth that distinguishes it from cognitive behavioural intervention. Morgan and Riley did not respond to clients' discussion of their drinking, anger or other criminogenic triggers, whether personal or social, with standardised techniques training on how clients might control themselves. Rather, clients were encouraged to explore the reasons for those issues, and how they might try to change their perspectives, and the values underlying those perspectives, to achieve a different outcome - to explore the potential consequences before drinking to excess, or to respond with empathy rather than anger. The outcome may arguably be the same as that of cognitive behaviouralism, but rather than the client controlling their own thinking (and thus behaviour) through cognitive techniques, they are instead empowered to recognise their own potential agentic choice within a situation (although, as will be seen in later chapters, this situational agency was far from absolute). This goes beyond best practice ideas of client/officer interaction - Bottoms' [2001] concept of 'representation' that encourages officers to provide offenders with opportunities to express their viewpoint and have it taken into account. Clients explained to me how they wanted to address these issues because they felt 'stuck' in particular patterns of action/reaction; rather than dictating an alternative pattern of action, supervisors strove to provide practical help in changing their behaviour through, parallel to above, the

deepest level of normative engagement possible: empowering their agency to recognise, and choose, different paths. While, undoubtedly, this remains a heavily individual focus for criminogenesis, and any response thereto, that is perhaps an inextricable facet of interpersonal supervision; and, while there is the attendant risk that clients may then bear greater responsibility should they choose 'wrongly' (as highlighted by Harrison [2006]), encouraging clients to undertake some active effort at resisting the challenges in their lives is preferable to powerless passivity. Nevertheless, it is also worth highlighting what will be an ongoing theme of supervision: namely, that while clients may develop sincere motivation, and undertake considerable personal effort, to address the challenges and obstacles in their lives, said issues prove too entrenched in societal inequalities and born of such considerable deprivation that they are beyond an individual response. As a result, while perhaps at first instance this process may be considered at odds with, for instance, Anderson's concept of 'bearing witness' [2016] - emphasising as the concept does the humanising, agency-endowing power of the client expressing their personal experiences of such inequality and deprivation over an outcome-driven focus on providing 'help' - it is important to stress that this form of interaction, even when it went beyond the clients' own narrative and into seeking solutions to their challenges, retained a focus on empowering clients to both develop and deploy their own solutions. Although, as this chapter demonstrates, there is undoubtedly an inherent benefit to affording clients with the space and attention to express themselves, with officers endeavouring to understand their perceptions, perspectives and contextual influences thereupon.

Returning to the exploration of clients' perspective of, and involvement with, the typical supervision interaction, there existed an apparent paradox during my observational fieldwork between the demonstrable client engagement with their supervisors, and the overwhelming majority who admitted to me during our private discussions that the only reason they attended supervision was because their attendance was mandatory. Despite

all the instances of seeking assistance, sharing personal information regarding their lives, and developing a strong personal rapport with their supervisor, clients freely stated that if it had not been a condition for breaching their CPO, they would not have attended. Such a seeming contradiction might have been readily explicable if there was a correlation between that statement and clients who were more reluctant to engage in the 'getting to know' them process, but the feeling was almost universal: ten out of the twelve participants involved in this case study expressed this feeling, ranging from challenging clients to those who appeared both personally invested and involved.

The solution to this apparent tension may lie in how supervision was framed - that is to say, the initial linguistic and interactive framework established by Morgan and Riley into which clients entered with this mindset. Although both supervisors discussed how the wider organisational and policy contexts within which they operated emphasised a public protection agenda - the identification and management of standardised criminogenic risk factors - both stressed that in practice their personal priorities were that of 'social inclusion'. By striving to address a client's wider social needs and challenges beyond their noted risk factors, a positive change away from reoffending and towards a nascent idea of desistance could be made. By addressing the problems a client faced in their daily lives, whilst simultaneously endeavouring to cultivate any pro-social assets (typically facets such as employment or family), the supervisor fulfilled the organisational/policy goal of public protection as consequence of a more constructive engagement, rather than a purely managerial objective.

But it is also this personal (and indeed interpersonal) emphasis on problem-solving and asset-building that may construct the client/supervisor interaction in such a way as to negate, or at least counteract, clients' unwillingness to attend. The role occupied by the supervisor carried with it obvious presupposition for clients which were activated by questions such as 'how was your week?' - such a question, asked by such a supervisor, within

the context of supervision, presupposed an answer that identified problems to then be solved. This explains why, despite already admitting that if they weren't obliged to attend they wouldn't have, several clients discussed how they also valued their supervision meetings as opportunities to "get the support I need", or "get put back on the right track". The very context of the interaction carried with it value assumptions by both parties - professional for the supervisors, and perceptual assumptions for clients - that inherently influenced their discourses.

A contributing factor to this client perception of supervision as a valuable, and worthwhile, supportive endeavour was one of the satellite functions of supervision: the brokerage of external, specialist services [Day, Hardcastle and Birgden, 2012]). Brokered services occupied an interesting twilight position within supervision: supervisors recognised, and openly expressed to clients, that external services boasted 'experts' in their given remit, who could assist clients with those particular issues far better than the supervisor could. But, on the other hand, those referrals were made as a result of collaborative discussions (and, importantly, agreements) between supervisors and clients, and supervisors would frequently check with their clients how their experiences of brokered services were proceeding, and whether anything they had learned might feed back into their own discussions. Thus, far from an emaciated relationship focussed on monitoring and enforcing compliance with a constellation of detached services [Burnett, Baker and Roberts, 2007], supervision aspired to serve as a holistic nexus, endeavouring to generate and weave together individual threads of support into an ongoing effort at engagement and assistance (thereby also endeavouring to sidestep Partridge's concern [2004] regarding disjointed facets of supervision leading to client confusion). However, on the subject of disjointment, one of the major challenges in supervisors' efforts to broker specialist services were the practical, resource-based limitations imposed upon them by the circumstances of such services. Creating a holistic nexus of multiple support threads was impossible when those threads failed to

generate due to limited programme spaces, wait times stretching into several months, and a lack of geographically proximate services specialising in clients' needs. While both clients and supervisors shared a mutual understanding of what support clients needed, the external contingencies of supervision often made it impossible to access the necessary support to address deep-seated problems such as employment or developmental trauma.

This is also a suitable opportunity to address a recurring theme in the chapter: the concept of 'problems', and to a lesser extent 'assets', throughout the process of understanding. While both notions are explored in a much fuller manner in the subsequent chapters, they do have a strong bearing on the theme of 'understanding' within supervision, especially Morgan and Riley's efforts at 'getting to know' clients. Both 'problems' and 'assets' (the former term directly lifted from their interactions, the latter extrapolated from broader, more accessible terminology such as 'things you want to improve' or 'what's going well for you') were as close as either supervisor came to preconceptions about their clients. As already mentioned, both supervisors approached with a framing understanding of their client interactions centred around the notion of 'social inclusion'. When this was married to the client-centric effort at harnessing their own perspective on their life, it gave rise to two categories of response from the supervisors. In discussing the latest or ongoing developments in their lives, clients would, from the supervisor's perspective, indicate either a problem in need of solving, or an asset to be protected or developed. Problems ranged from classically criminogenic issues such as housing, lack of employment, anti-social peer groups or more historic, developmental issues such as childhood abuse, to issues that could potentially hamper ongoing efforts at desistance, typically either negative relationships or ongoing crises rooted in a client's societal context. Assets, on the other hand, were perceived by supervisors as constructive factors in clients' lives that could promote desistance or resilience, such as employment/skills-development and positive (typically familial) relationships.

Thus, while the overarching dynamic of 'getting to know' clients was client-centric, this did constitute a key interpretive bottleneck between the stages of developing an understanding and responding to that understanding, wherein that understanding would be categorised into one or the other. Supervisors would encourage clients to collaborate on a solution to any problem they brought them, or provide personal encouragement or a specialist service to help in developing an asset.

From the clients' perspectives, none expressed any resentment or discomfort at this ready categorisation. Many of the talking points clients raised were unambiguously one or the other; with regard to problems, clients raised them because they were looking for help in devising or executing a solution, whilst they appreciated support and encouragement in areas of their lives they considered to be highlights. If several clients did recognise any limitation that this categorisation caused, it was the instrumental quality with which it imbued supervision meetings: instances of simply talking with supervisors like two ordinary people was rare, as topics either involved something to solve, or something to encourage.

That is not to say that this practice undermined the centrality of the client's perspective. Even in constructing the framework of supervision, Morgan and Riley were clear in giving considerable space therein to clients, that they might determine its specific subject-matter. It was a consistent theme in the early meetings of both supervisors for them to ask clients to envisage an ideal state for themselves a year hence - "where do you want to see yourself in twelve months' time?" - and based on the clients' answer a to-do list of interventions, specialist services and discussion topics would be drawn up. Again, it was evident that the interaction carried presuppositions - what problems did the client want to overcome, what assets did they want to acquire or develop, what changes did they want to make - but within that question and its assumptions there was still an emphasis on client agency. It was, after all, a question that invites an answer. Clients were not obliged to change (interpersonal capital may have been frequently applied in attempts

at leverage, but that warrants its own discussion later), and indeed the emphasis on giving them a space within which to describe, and receive practical assistance in pursuing, an ideal life was responded to positively. Clients felt humanised: they were "not just some criminal", with supervisors redefining the risks, challenges or personal flaws in their lives as 'obstacles' to be overcome rather than indelible, defining facets of their identities, whilst emphasising and encouraging positive facets.

In terms of significance, this framework demonstrates the rich complexity of supervision. Most basically, it demonstrates that the interplay between 'traditional' client-engagement, change-driven social work and risk management is more complex than a unilateral takeover of the former by the latter in a process of increased prescription and standardisation [Annison, Eadie and Knight, 2008]. While a vein of risk discourse does run through supervision interactions, and public protection is the explicit professional motivation for supervisors, neither stakeholder is committed to this as an overarching goal - at the cost of constructive support, dialogic exchange and collaborative problem solving - because it exists within a wider interpersonal framework that actually demonstrates signs of a nascent desistance model [McNeill, 2006]. Based on McNeill's foundational paradigm for desistance, there are some clear parallels in supervision's concept of change: an effort to foster agency and reflexivity in client behaviour, a mutually supportive focus not only on clients' risks and needs but constructive assets in their lives, and an effort to build their capital in order to assist them in a more permanent move away from offending (although with a heavy focus on the motivations- and-skills element of human capital as opposed to social capital's opportunities).

In terms of how risk discourse is incorporated into this predominantly change-driven paradigm, it would appear that supervision approaches its Risk/Need/Responsivity influences more in line with the model's core principles than its elaborately developed practice [Bonta et al., 2008]: namely, a client's risk determines the frequency of meetings (set initially through

standardised assessment, but subject to alteration based on ongoing interactions, with a typical lessening over the course of supervision), their needs set out broad initial categories within which supervisors seek to establish a more personalised and engaged stance, and perhaps most importantly (and most frequently overlooked by contemporary risk management), the principle of responsivity is expanded beyond its original remit of clients' 'learning styles' to fully place them as the influential subject of supervision, rather than the influenced object. 'Getting to know' a client is not simply viewing them through a particular lens, but giving them both the space to communicate their own perspectives and perceptions and the 'responsivity' to incorporate that into supervision. In this sense, risk discourse serves its more idealised purpose, as envisioned by Bonta and Andrews [2010], than the oft-criticised managerial system: one in which risk factors act as the beginning to understanding rather than its end, and the interventions to which they point emphasise building and developing a client's positive potential, rather than controlling their negative potential. This situation is only facilitated by the supplementary aspirational asset-building efforts present in the interactions.

But perhaps the most peculiar facet of this 'getting to know' effort's significance (especially given the assertions of CPO's policy context) lies in what is absent, namely any punitive element. Clients perceived attendance for supervision meetings as an obligation, but neither an onerous or punitive one; indeed while they were aware of the consequences for repeated non-attendance, their perception of supervision was more comparable to a doctor's or dentist's appointment. They were aware of the wider penal context of their situation; it simply did not factor into their ongoing perception of supervision. Similarly, while clients' problems and assets were discussed, their actual offending was rarely brought up, and never for long. Clients certainly recognised and appreciated this, with numerous statements that the focus on their wider lives, issues and aspirations complimented this lack of focus on the actual offence for which they had received the CPO - typical

remarks indicated that it made them feel like 'a real person' or 'more than just a criminal'. Offending was not even brought up in a classically constructive, Duffian way [2003a and b] as a means of expressing wrongdoing and the possibility of redemption; what this would seem to suggest is not only is the notion of punishment considered anathema to constructive social work within CPO supervision [Hignett, 2000], but that the interactions between supervisor and client keep clear of the moral content such significance contains. 'Good' and 'bad', or 'right' and 'wrong' were not terms heard with any sort of regularity in meetings. Amongst supervisors, there existed an unspoken concern, and commensurate effort to avoid, what McNeill [2004, p242] would term 'the enforced re-education of offenders to redress their deficits'; even avoiding the excesses of punitivism, the notion of punishment risked toxifying the focus on problem-solving and asset-building with judgementalism, and compounding the client's already considerable pressures with a weighty sense of wrongdoing. Supervision was about 'helping' clients. While that may have contained a moral judgement about the preferability of clients' post-help lifestyle, and the means of help often took an educative format, there was a notable absence of moralisation in the tone of the help, and the education was open and empowering rather than prescriptive.

However, there were exceptions to the emphasis on clients' own self-understanding as the core of supervision interactions. Some exceptions were obvious and unavoidable, given the contingencies of the situation: when specialist, external services were being arranged for clients, there was considerable preparative discussion to 'make fit' clients' particular issues with the more generic, standardised purview of the service.

By far the more interesting exceptions, however, occurred in those rare instances where the self-understanding expressed by the client conflicted with the understanding their supervisor had developed, or was in the process of developing, regarding their client.

One of Morgan's most difficult clients was Christopher: a flippan

twenty year-old with a tendency for telling self-aggrandising lies. For several meetings prior, Morgan encouraged Christopher to meet with a counsellor, and repeatedly recommended services that dealt with either self-esteem or childhood trauma issues. Morgan suspected that Christopher's offending behaviour was related to one or both of those facets, and that he was reluctant to confront those issues. Christopher, on the other hand, claimed simply that he was dubious about counsellors, doubting what "someone who just read a book once" could offer that would help him. While Morgan couldn't compel Christopher to seek counselling, they continued to regularly encourage and suggest available services, and occasionally raised the topics of self-esteem and childhood trauma as an implicit offer to discuss them.

There was never a confrontation by either supervisor when their understanding of a client didn't line up with the client's own. Both Morgan and Riley recognised that if a client didn't want to acknowledge some suspected facet of their life or self, then any explicit attempt to discuss it would be ineffective at best, and detrimental to their rapport at worst. Like with Christopher, both would offer indirect, implicit opportunities for clients to raise the suspected facet with them. This led to an interesting co-existence of two parallel perceptual realities: the supervisor believing the client is refusing to acknowledge some 'problem', and the client either refusing to do so, or perhaps being truthful in not suffering from the suspected 'problem'. What is most telling about supervision in this situation, however, is that it was invariably the client's perceptual reality that won out - regardless of what their supervisors suspected clients to be facing or suffering from, whether that be abusive spouses, drinking or anti-social associations, there was no unilateral action taken on the back of those suspicions. If a client did not acknowledge a problem or ask for help from their supervisor, there was nothing Morgan or Riley were prepared to do beyond offer as many opportunities to raise the

suspected problem as was supportable and acceptable within the context of their given relationship.

Part 2 - Establishing 'Rapport'

'Getting to know' a client was not an automatic process achieved simply by the passage of time and mounting hours of supervision meetings. Reaching a position where clients were willing to 'open up' about themselves, their lives and their perspectives was inextricably linked to developing a 'rapport' with them: an interpersonal relationship that transcended purely professional efficacy, touching upon a profoundly human space of trust, respect and sympathy.

The importance of this rapport, and its inextricable link to developing understanding, was clear from the same initial meeting with Martin. The reluctance he demonstrated in sharing with Morgan his own perspective on his problems can largely be attributed to this lack of rapport - the absence of a strong relationship between the two prevented an effective sharing of information, and the solution of 'getting to know' Martin was more a question of developing a personal relationship with him rather than further questions/answer sessions. At first, this seemed as though Morgan was putting the cart in front of the horse; how could a meaningful, personally-resonant relationship be established between the two when Martin was reluctant to share more than ten words at a time with Morgan? But, over the course of my observations with both Morgan and Riley, the more I came to recognise that rapport and understanding did not operate on a linear progression from one to the other, but established a cyclical interplay where each further enhanced its counterpart, creating a dynamo that drove the supervisory process.

It was towards the end of my observations with Riley, and I was sitting in on their third meeting with Bruce - a young man in his late teens,

passed through the fostering system throughout most of his life, who had been issued a CPO for repeated property crimes. Bruce, much like Martin, had been a difficult client to engage with, and so in this meeting Riley sought to take things "back to basics" and discuss Bruce's past. Bruce was initially reluctant, explaining that as a ward of the state passed amongst various foster families, he's sceptical when it comes to discussing his past. But the very fact he mentioned multiple families prompted Riley's concern, and they went on to ask Bruce what went wrong with his foster families. Bruce began to explain the various problems: abusive adults, exacerbated by his own misbehaviour (typically running away) stemming from his lack of trust and, he eventually admitted, a difficult-to-describe fear of "too much change" in his life. As Bruce gradually opened up, Riley tread carefully in their responses: typically repeating back what Bruce had just said in different terms, demonstrating their own effort at listening and understanding Bruce's perspective ("he needs to feel he's being heard", Riley explained to me later), followed by questions that both prompted further information whilst simultaneously demonstrating a sympathetic stance. Simple things like "what happened after that?" or "how did you feel going back into the system?". In the most vulnerable moment I witnessed of him, Bruce, surprised and worried, realised that he couldn't remember anything before roughly the age of nine; when Riley suggested that perhaps his brain was protecting him from something, Bruce nodded and admitted that he didn't feel part of his birth family any more (with whom he still has infrequent, and invariably negative, contact).

Questions from the supervisors were the catalyst for the gradual, tentative process of building rapport. As with the general process of developing an understanding based on clients' gleaned perspectives, these questions were the start of discussions: initial stimuli for details which could

then be unpacked and explored through prompting, wherein the supervisor's explicit, interested response to client details encouraged them to provide further, and deeper, information.

While the information gained from the client sharing their perspective was relevant for the 'getting to know' process, the dynamic of question/answer interaction was far more pertinent to the development of rapport. Through questioning, Morgan and Riley were able to demonstrate attentiveness ('active listening', in their professional terminology), and by responding to details in clients' responses could not only prompt further information but show an even greater degree of interest, framing their additional prompts as personal concern or a desire for further clarity of understanding. Questions delivered in this way did not lead to more detailed, in-depth answers simply by virtue of being further questions; the emotive content and context established by the way the questions were presented engaged clients, developing a growing willingness to reflect upon and share their perspectives. Clients' answers presented supervisors with an opportunity to positively and engagingly respond or react, and using that to develop a bond with clients.

This rapport was strengthened by the emphasis upon client individualisation, and the opportunities for engagement that afforded. The question/answer and response process enabled clients to be talked with, rather than simply at, and so even in basic, practical discussions where clients sought assistance with mundane problems (some of the most common being a call by their supervisors to the benefits department in order to clarify some financial issue) this effort at personal engagement was still possible. Indeed, as 'rapport' developed, the back-and-forth question/answer process became more and more streamlined, until clients were offering details about their problems or lives spontaneously - having developed, in turn, their very own understanding of how their supervisor approached helping them - as well as responding to open comments in a naturalistic, conversation style as opposed to explicitly mechanical questioning. Indeed,

this was not only an ideal state for their interpersonal relationship from an efficiency perspective, but for clients' own engagement with the process: they appeared to flourish under this opportunity to engage in a human discussion, one still framed by a focus on providing assistance, but lacking the explicit overtones of professional formality and judicial sentence that the more mechanised interactive mode entailed.

Morgan and Riley were both keenly aware of the importance of developing a strong rapport with their clients, with Morgan describing the ideal working relationship being "open, honest, warm and trusting". Riley expanded upon this idea, explaining how a demonstration of openness, honesty and warmth was the initial catalyst for rapport: a means of demonstrating respect for and interest in the clients not simply as clients, but as people. It was not simply enough for supervisors to say that they were sympathetic to clients' problems or interested in helping them; the sincerity of their care had to come through action, which slowly fostered the final idea Morgan expressed: trust.

Unsurprisingly, this facet of supervision, with its emphasis on supervisor and client developing a personal bond that facilitates a commensurately personal investment in the supervisory process on the client's part, provides a valuable unpacking of the key mechanisms by which the interpersonal process and normative engagement rationale co-function. The importance of a constructive relationship between the two stakeholders is a fact well-established by research: the demonstration by supervisors of a sincere desire and effort to support clients, which in turn generates a reciprocal commitment by the client to act upon that support and pursue a change towards non-offending [Rex, 1999]. That a relational bond between supervisor and client is necessary for '*quality* work' as the primary 'vehicle for change' [Grant and McNeill, 2015, p157] is not only expanded upon by this exploration of their interactive dynamics, but may actually link to another critical finding of prior research: the need for supervisors to 'respond creatively to individual offenders' [p159] is paralleled, and to a certain extent

addressed, by this dynamic, client-facing relationship. While, as already mentioned, external specialist services are nowhere near as flexible, the supervisory relationship between supervisor and client does not only demonstrate a capacity to respond to clients' individual needs and circumstances, but is founded on that facet as the central driver of the interpersonal process. Commensurately, that creative rationale cannot be achieved without the interpersonal process that develops support and reciprocity, creating a cyclical interlink.

Over the course of two months, Morgan had managed to make some small progress with Martin. This was largely centred around assisting him with housing, benefits and other financial issues, but the seemingly practical nature of this support was made much more resonant when Martin explained why he was seeking his supervisor's support: he was trying to 'get his life in order' to demonstrate his improvement as a father and thus gain increased custody over his children. During one meeting, however, Martin returned to his quieter, more recalcitrant state, and eventually admitted that he has begun drinking heavily once again. While never having quit entirely, Martin had been struggling to control his alcoholism, as he typically offended whilst under the influence. He told Morgan that he was feeling guilty about his slip, but when Morgan sympathised and said he had been making such good progress with alcoholism, Martin hesitantly replied that it was more than that. He explained he only drank when he felt stressed, and that while he never drank in front of them, custody over his children had been stressing him to the point that he'd stopped enjoying having them with them. Given Martin's uncertain but clearly negative relationship with his own parents, Morgan attempted to raise some of the positive developments with his children recently: his daughter has recently started nursery, and shows signs of good performance. Mentioning that picking her up is one of the highlights of

his day, Martin began to discuss ways he might be able to relieve some of the stress of custody.

In my discussions with clients, all those who ended up establishing a positive rapport with their supervisors expressed a consistent message: their supervisor was 'someone they could talk to', 'someone who took them for who they were' or 'someone who wanted to help'. They believed in their supervisor as a non-judgemental, supportive figure because Morgan and Riley both positioned themselves in a certain way during meetings. These efforts at 'getting to know' their clients served dual humanising efforts that clients picked up on: the first was the simple effort of getting to know them as complex people rather than simple offenders, and the second was creating a space to allow clients to shape that understanding themselves. And by using their responses to demonstrate interest, sympathy and a lack of judgement, supervisors not only vindicated that openness, but encouraged more of it - once clients trusted them with small, less significant details and were responded to positively and supportive, they could open up about larger, more significant issues. Supervision was explicitly presented as a 'safe space' or 'sanctuary' - somewhere clients could discuss whatever was bothering them, whether that was simply to get worries off their chest, or so that they could receive help from their supervisor.

The strength of this process was its adaptability, capable of starting at any level of client recalcitrance or (un)willingness to share, and naturally developing from there. Even initially deflective and monosyllabic clients gradually opened up in inches and stages, as their supervisor responded to those few shreds of understanding they shared in the aforementioned way: without judgement, as part of a wider effort to appreciate them fully as human beings, and with an eye to working out what assistance they could provide. Once the supervisor was able to vindicate this position - typically, at the outset, through some simple, practical service such as assisting with welfare claims or acting as a representative with job-seekers staff - then the process

could grow cyclically, with clients sharing more, allowing supervisors greater opportunities to demonstrate their sincerity and efficacy in helping, which in turn encouraged clients to share yet more.

Drawing on research from Armstrong and Weaver [2010], it is interesting to note that two contrasting findings from their research emerged from the supervisor/client relationship - namely that some clients found the relationship intrusive and exploitative, while others perceived it to be a meaningful opportunity for discussion and support. Considering this in light of the interactions observed during CPO supervision, and the association in both pieces of research between trust and a positive relationship, it would seem to indicate that the client's trust in their supervisor's sincerity to help is the fulcrum upon which the interpersonal interaction turns either positive or negative. In the negative client accounts of probation included in Armstrong and Weaver's research, these perspectives can be linked to this lack of trust in supervisor sincerity - either because clients felt they needed 'to start doing things for yourself' or that they were being made to 'feel like a kid sittin there' [2010, p16]. By contrast, some of the positive client accounts also hint at the cyclical relationship between the client sharing information with their supervisor, the supervisor's demonstrable, individualised understanding in response, and the rapport of respect and efficacy that develops as a result. More than merely the centrality of trust as a key determinant of supervision's success, this would suggest, in accordance with the observed efforts of Morgan and Riley to present themselves in a particularly trustworthy manner to clients, that trust was the sole privilege of the client. It was a perception that must be earned, and needed to be in order for supervision to be fruitful.

In a similarly neat parallel, there are distinct similarities between the supervisors' self-presentations and Lewis' deconstruction of the probation relationship [2014]: namely the emphasis on 'acceptance' of clients, both in a general sense as complex individuals, but also in a personal sense of demonstrating an empathetic, positive attitude that facilitated interpersonal engagement. If one distinction may be found, it is in a crucial difference

regarding the importance of maintaining a 'non-judgemental' atmosphere. While Lewis characterises a constructive non-judgemental atmosphere as a separation between the individual and their behaviour, supervision interactions in this study did not make such a separation, but instead recognised that offending or otherwise problematic behaviour was the product of client choice. Crucially, however, was the explicit recognition and efforts to address the fact that said choice was, in turn, the product of wider issues in a client's life that could, with effort, be addressed and changed. Clients were not made to feel lesser or morally deviant for their wrongdoing; rather, it was presented as a symptom of deprivations and inequalities that supervision aspired to help them overcome. In this way, non-judgementalism was balanced with an effort at agency and empowerment, side-stepping Lewis' [2014] concerns surrounding the potential for clients to be 'belittled' and 'patronised' by supervisors.

While clients were encouraged to increasingly trust their supervisor, the countervailing concept - namely the risk of the client's reoffending as perceived by the supervisor - occupied a more tenuous position in their interactions. In the aforementioned spirit of 'openness' and 'honesty', supervisors were very clear with clients about the need for them to 'stay on the right track'. The implication of this term was, given the context of problem-solving and aspirational development, that clients were making positive progress towards a state of desistance, and while many of their ongoing criminogenic issues were obstacles towards that progress, others were viewed by supervisors as potential threats that could deviate the client back into offending behaviour. In this sense, 'risk' occupied a much more managerial position than it did in the wider context of 'getting to know' a client, but even here the interaction was telling. Both Morgan and Riley were profoundly aware of their limitations - they had, both explained, at best an hour a week with each of their clients in a meeting room, whereas the client had to get through the rest of the week or fortnight on their own. While their sole resource of warnings and breaches had a peculiar viability worth

discussing later, it was recognised that 'managing' a client's potential to reoffend or undertake similar risky behaviour could not be externally engineered through threats or control mechanisms. It was an effort that could only be achieved with the client as a collaborator; hence the framing of the discussion as one of 'right tracks' and 'progress' - to make resilience relevant to clients by presenting it in a metric of the effort they had already invested in change, which would be wasted by a 'slip back into offending'. Far from being seen as an effort to control them, many clients appreciated this presentation of concern; one of Morgan's clients, Vicky, discussed with me how supportive it had been to have her supervisor "help me get my life back on track" and "make sure I sorted myself out". Within the wider, demonstrable narrative of sincere support, even risk management took on a more appreciated hue.

This tentative presence of risk discourse within supervisor/client interactions can be contrasted with analyses of stricter, more managerial control systems predicated on similar discourse significances. It suggests that the distinction between a 'supportive' and 'surveilling' relationship is not absolute; in a relationship where terms such as 'working alliance' and 'give and take' are used as descriptors, there is a clear if implicit sense of mutual obligations [Burnett and McNeill, 2005]. In a similar way to the supervisor demonstrating some value, efficacy or usefulness to the client in order to build trust, the incorporation of a distilled risk discourse into the wider context of a supportive and honest relationship can similarly side-step the dangers of managerialism, confrontation and hierarchical control [Worrall and Hoy, 2005] - clients undertaking a self-management effort not out of training techniques or leveraged organisational power, but from an (inter)personal sense of commitment. While the supervisor setting out a supposed 'right track' may still be a troubling proposition - redolent with implications of overbalanced individual responsibility for criminogenesis, and imposed objective morality (or at least behaviouralism) - it remains important to emphasise that the pursuit of desistance (with which the supervisory relationship is predominantly aligned) is towards the goal of a client's own change in self-

identity.

There is also, on the topic of troubling propositions, the uncomfortable implication inherent in the marriage between a supervisor's professional significance of desistance (and consequent public protection), and the interpersonal relationship utilised as a vehicle to achieve that. Similarly to Trotter's account of pro-social modelling [2008], wherein subtle physical and non-verbal cues, as well as quasi-Pavlovian treatment, are used to encourage positive client behaviour, so too does this cyclical dynamic between client and supervisor raise a profoundly ethical question about the emotional manipulation of clients towards a desired end. In truth, there seems no ready solution to this problem, save perhaps the hope that supervisors' efforts at supporting client change come from a deeper, more sincere and personal motivation to help another individual, than merely fulfil a professional goal (a hope that, at least in regards to Morgan and Riley, would seem vindicated).

As a final note, while some supervisor/client relationships progressed further than others, with some clients showing greater trust in the extent and depth of information they shared, there was only one client I observed with whom I can say rapport was not established. Discussions between Morgan and their client Christopher never progressed beyond a basic discussion of Christopher's day-to-day practical problems or hobby-level interests. While Morgan continuously endeavoured to encourage a deeper discussion, Christopher proved both dismissive and occasionally undermining of their relationship - often responding to offers of help or expressions of sympathy with assertions that Morgan was 'paid to say that', as well as making self-aggrandising (and wholly untrue) claims about his life. It became clear in my discussions with Christopher that he simply didn't trust Morgan, believing that his supervisor's efforts at personal engagement and/or help were not sincere, but merely instrumental flattery or professional interference driven by organisational goals. Without this trust, rapport could not be developed and thus a deeper, more meaningful understanding could not be achieved, which

reduced supervision for Christopher to little more than shallow discussion of foundational topics and the most menial of practical assistance on Morgan's part.

Part 3 - Overcoming the "Dunno" Factor

In the entirety of my observations, I never once heard a client say 'no'. While Martin and others were often initially reluctant and recalcitrant in their participation, and Christopher subtly undermined efforts to engage with him, in the ongoing exchange of discursive 'moves' there was never an explicit refusal to participate. Rather, those breaks in the discursive exchange - questions unanswered, comments left hanging, offers neither accepted nor rejected - were often the product of one simple word: "dunno" (I don't know).

"Dunno" halted supervisor efforts. When Morgan and Riley attempted to explore a problem that had arisen with a client during the past week or fortnight, "Dunno" would roadblock their inquiry. When they tried to discuss how a client felt about some facet of their life, "Dunno" would deflect their effort at interest and support. Whenever a supervisor asked a question, tried to prompt or probe for more information, or otherwise made an attempt to engage a client's own perspective, "Dunno" was the response that shut down their sequence of interaction, diverted any expression of or effort at empathy and assistance, and created an artificial irrelevancy for the topic at hand. In a process that strove to place the client's own perspective and understanding at the centre of supervision, if the client claimed they didn't have one for a given topic, then that topic was moot.

It was Riley's first meeting with David. Like many supervision meetings where rapport has yet to be successfully developed, it necessitated considerable initial effort from Riley to establish the relationship's momentum. When Riley asked David about his expectations of the Order - both what he thought it would involve, and what he would like

it to involve - David shrugged and stated, simply, that he wasn't bothered by the Order. He had to show up, so he did. Riley persisted, attempting to explain that supervision can be seen as an opportunity: if there were changes David wanted to make in his life, supervision could help make them. Otherwise, if he was happy living the way he did, they could just focus on making sure he got through his Order without complications or breaches. But when Riley began asking David whether there was any changes he'd like to make, or any problems he'd like to address, the conversation faltered once more; David's only problem was the broad, unwieldy goal of "not committing any more crimes", and he claimed he otherwise had no problems in his life. Riley then turned to David's social work report, breaking it down in intelligible terms to see whether it was accurate in David's opinion, and whether there was anything he'd like to clarify or alter. Once again, David shrugged - the report was "alright". The meeting ended soon after with Riley once again trying to encourage David to think about what kind of life he wanted, and that even small changes can make positive differences.

The "Dunno" could be anything - a verbal response, or even something as simple as a grunt or a shrug - but the function remained universal: it brought the current strand of supervisor/client interaction to a halt. It was as obstructive as a simple 'no', but deflective in such a way as to prevent any confrontational response to which such a refusal could lead. While supervisors could, and often did, attempt to approach the same topic from different directions, often simplifying their inquiries or narrowing the topic to a smaller aspect, in conversations with me they expressed the perception that "Dunno" was rarely a product of a client's lack of knowledge, but rather an unwillingness to answer.

This is, perhaps, where the ethics of supervision become questionable. I do not doubt the sincerity of Riley's statement to David that, if

he was happy with the state of his life, then his supervisory meetings could be focussed on ensuring a formal compliance that carried him through the Order without complication. I had already seen several clients of Morgan's, such as Christopher, who had been largely uninterested in receiving any kind of support for personal change-work. The challenge emerged, however, in the conflict of realities that arose from such situations. Such clients didn't want to engage in change-work, and while on the one hand supervisors respected that choice, on the other they were compelled, both by professional obligations as well as personal ethos, to continuously offer open invitations and opportunities to clients. Christopher was one such client uninterested in change-work, but that lack of interest did not stop Morgan repeatedly offering him the chance to engage in an available counselling service for several psychological issues they suspected Christopher of suffering from. While the repeated offers were framed in such a way as to suggest a standing, open invitation rather than a refusal to take an implicit 'no' for an answer, it was the origin of such offers that may be more problematic. In the face of a client's "Dunno" response, supervisors did not simply abandon either their effort to provide help and support to clients in addressing their problems, or their effort to develop a guiding understanding of clients in pursuing such. That was their fundamental perspective on supervision, and in the absence of the client providing their own perspective, these efforts were instead forced to draw upon what basic information supervisors could glean from clients' basic responses or their social work reports. In Christopher's case, this led to an educated but ultimately unverified estimation of psychological issues, while in others all that could be offered as a result were generic group-work or substance misuse programmes.

Thus, when clients exhibited the "Dunno" factor, a parallel effort to this generic offering took place on the part of supervisors. An effort to engage the client in such a way as to indirectly address the unwillingness that blocked attempts at a more meaningful, individual understanding (and corresponding

support).

The primary challenge, as Riley described it in our discussions, was that clients were often held back by their own negative self-perceptions. They were reluctant to discuss those facets of their lives that would be described in supervision as their risk factors, criminogenic needs or even pro-social assets and aspirations because they evoke feelings of a lack of self-worth or memories of past trauma. Hence their "Dunno" reply as a deflection measure to avoid discussing even their refusal to discuss the topic. The challenge for their supervisor then becomes altering that sense of self-perception (a profoundly significant facet of client motivation, discussed in the subsequent chapter) so clients are willing to open up, if not about the topic in question, then at least their reluctance to discuss it.

It was Martin's supervision meetings with Morgan that motivated me to label this phenomenon "Dunno", as it was a favoured response from him whenever Morgan attempted to discuss his childhood or relationship with his parents (which, based on his social work report, Morgan suspected had a significant negative influence upon his early development). The most Morgan was ever able to get out of Martin was a cryptic, but still deflection, claim: "you wouldn't believe me if I told you". When Martin did open up about his childhood and family, it wasn't through a direct discussion or inquiry; it was a subsequent explanation to a conversation the two had about his own family, particularly his children. In explaining, with a certain degree of personal pride, that he didn't drink in front of his children, or that sometimes he was even able to cut back his drinking so as to save up some extra money for those days he had custody rights, Morgan asked why this was so important to him. "Because I don't want to be like my folks, and I don't want them to end up like me", he answered. From there, Morgan and Martin entered into a nearly half-hour discussion of his own parents' alcoholism, and the abuse and neglect

he suffered as a child. It wasn't the end of Martin responding to questions and prompts with "Dunno", but at least with regard to his own childhood and family he became more open afterwards.

Because Morgan approached Martin's reluctance from a position of strength and positive self-perception, he became more willing to share information. Rather than his self-perspective being one of him as a victim of his parents, he was able to convey the same understanding through the radically different lens of his agentic choice to be a better parental figure to his own children. Indeed, rather than simply developing an understanding of Martin as an offender whose behaviour is rooted in external, developmental factors, this increased effort and altered perspective allowed for a far more complex understanding that emphasised, to both Morgan and Martin, his potential for self-driven change.

This varying level of involvement in the understanding process, and the interpersonal relationship established by the supervisor in response, seems to have a clear parallel with Robinson and McNeill's distinction between formal and substantive compliance [2008]. With regards to the "Dunno" factor, the former denotes a relationship between the two where the client is, or remains, unwilling to share their own perspective; not only is the client only interested in meeting the minimum requirements to pass through their Order without complication, but in the ongoing spirit of client-centred practice, the supervisor largely calibrates their meetings to match that interest, transforming supervision into a lean form of pragmatic assistance. The preferable state, and the one to which the supervisor will still endeavour to progress, is the more substantive normative engagement of client cooperation, willingly sharing information, engaging in discourse and collaboratively formulating responses.

The transition between the two, at least insofar has been observed with Morgan and Riley, has a noteworthy similarity to Lewis' notion of 'buying in' [2014]. The encouragement of a more substantive

compliance/engagement not only takes place within the matrix of a supportive interpersonal relationship - what would be termed here as 'rapport' - but involves the explicit nurturing of more positive self-conceptions on the part of the client. However, in contrast to the 'pro-social push' noted in Lewis' research - whereby clients' behaviours and attitudes would be directly challenged (importantly, to note, still within the aforementioned supportive relationship) - in these interactions the transition from negative self-conceptions to positive growth was far more indirect, fluid and cognisant of the duality present in many client behaviours. Taking Martin as an example, rather than challenge his drinking, or inquire in a frank and straight-talking way about his childhood, Morgan instead found a nascent aspect of pre-existing positive self-conception, and through that was able to begin understanding, and addressing, Martin's alcoholism.

On the other hand, however, the supervisory response to the "Dunno" factor embodies one of the core problems with the entirety of supervision's emphasis on understanding - and, indeed, its other core themes of motivation and problem solving - which is the dark side of individualisation. While, on the one hand, the significances of supervisor/client interactions - both risk- and change-based - are founded on a personalised understanding of the client derived from their own perspective, on the other this has a propensity to give rise to what Clear [2005] terms 'individuation': the progress, and success, of supervision is carried solely by those same two individuals, while wider collectives, social entities and forces are overlooked or excluded by the very nature of supervision. While, as already discussed, there is something to be said for a process that encourages client agency in confronting and addressing their own problems, this should not be at the expense of tackling the wider context that contributed to these problems. Issues of housing, for instance, go beyond any individual client, requiring local authorities to address concerns of safety and quality. As an expansion upon that same problem, the "Dunno" factor, or rather supervisory efforts to overcome it, rest considerable weight upon the client to personally and individually address

difficulties typically drawn from the wider contexts of their lives and upbringings - an issue only compounded by the aforementioned limitation of wider resources to support clients. While an approach that emphasises constructive, strengths-based self-conceptualisation is preferable to more managerial efforts [Robinson, 2005], it nevertheless excludes the wider picture at the expense of a greater burden placed upon clients.

Understanding - Client-Centred, Supervisor-Framed

Bringing together the theme of understanding in supervision, the impact it had upon the intersubjective realities within the CPO seems initially simple to describe. Interactions between supervisors and clients were constructed in such a way as to afford the client a meaningful space within which to shape supervision - the extent to which it focused on normative engagement or pragmatic assistance, the involvement of brokered external services, as well as what and how risk factors and change-work were addressed. Supervisors' questions were presented as invitations, handing over the momentum of discussion to clients whilst providing supplementary encouragement and demonstrating interest, concern and sympathy; client terminology was adopted to make supervision and its methods of support relevant to them, both in the sense of seeking their engagement and being applicable to their individual needs. In this regard, there is a clear parallel with 'person-centred' practice [Burnett and McNeill, 2005]: harnessing a client's own perceptions and perspectives to both facilitate their involvement and provide a more focussed, individualised means of support and assistance. The emphasis demonstrated in this chapter on positive rapport built on genuine support, alongside efforts to establish mutual understanding of the client and agreement in how to respond to issues, are all key positive factors in successful change-driven supervisor/client relationships [McNeill et al., 2005].

However, a closer examination of the interactions between supervisor

and client suggest that the realities produced were more complex than this. While the client may have been centred within the understanding process, that centre-point existed within a wider framework constructed by the supervisor. From the social moves made to elicit a client's own perspective to the encouragement and engagement undertaken to establish rapport and overcome a client's potential reluctance, the supervisor occupied a critical yet subtle framing position that continuously endeavoured to engage clients on an ever-deeper, more interpersonal level. While clients were free to gate-keep this progress by refusing to share the core currency of information, that did not stop the supervisor from endeavouring to further engage and understand. In this sense, while supervision demonstrated a considerable space for the client to shape the intersubjective reality between them and supervisor, the understanding that shaped it so is, in its own right, the product of a prior reality: the broader context constructed by the supervisor through the nature of their interaction with the client. To draw from Deering [2011], the gradient of power between the two stakeholders was distinctly unequal: not only in terms of the formal abilities and resources available to the supervisor as a professional social worker, but more importantly their influence over the course and shape of their discourse. However, to continue drawing upon Deering's arguments, such disparity does not undermine a sincere effort at supervisor/client collaboration, respectful treatment and empowering clients to make their own informed decisions (as opposed to being the passive subject of intervention).

Nevertheless, the nature of this client free space as a constructed enclosure within a wider, supervisor-driven effort is crucial for understanding the social reality of supervision. The reason for this constant endeavour, and the entire framework constructed to support it, may lie in the fundamental significance of the interaction, as understood by the supervisor: that of the curious amalgam of risk discourse and proto-desistance change-work. The supervisor approached clients with the perception of an individual facing challenges and obstacles in their life, which simultaneously endanger

reoffending and hamper any efforts and assets on the client's part to desist. That was the repertoire deployed in conversations with and questions posited to the client, with the latter overwriting the former as a mutual priority. It was this fundamental, preliminary understanding of the client, achieved before any further, individualised understanding is achieved, that informed and drove the wider context of the supervisor's constant efforts at further engagement, and guided the questions and lines of inquiry in response to which the client conveyed their own perspective on their own lives. A personal desire to help, within a professional medium of engagement and support, constructed the generic framework within which specification and individualisation was achieved through the client's involvement. Attentiveness to the client engaged not only ideas of humanising the client as an active agent [Anderson, 2016], but married such normative virtues with positive, practical dividends [McNeill, 2006].

Thus, while supervisor and client did labour to create some (considerable and specific) degree of mutually-negotiated reality, based on a client-guided understanding of their problems/assets and consequent collaboratively-developed solutions informed by such an understanding, that shared reality was inextricably dyed by the supervisor's own perception of the client as an individual facing such problems, possessing such assets and in potential need of support in finding such solutions. However, as has already been demonstrated with the "Dunno" factor, and will become increasingly more apparent over the coming chapters, this supervisor framework reinforces McCulloch's concerns [2005]: that while clients' social problems may be 'listened to', supervisors still lack an effective means of tackling such obstacles.

Chapter 6 - Fostering Client Motivation

It is no doubt already clear from a discussion of the theme of understanding within supervision meetings that 'motivation' is an inextricable thread running throughout the entirety of supervisor/client interactions. From the development of rapport to overcoming the challenges of the 'dunno' factor, encouraging client engagement was key to an individualised understanding.

But as the supervisors themselves noted, talk is comparatively easy. Action is much harder to achieve, and to motivate. Borrowing from Robinson and McNeill's typology [2008], while client engagement in sharing information was a step beyond formal rules-adherence, it was only the first tentative step towards actual, substantive involvement with the primary goal of supervision: achieving tangible change in clients' lives that could facilitate resilience and desistance.

Tangible change, however, required action on the client's part. From the attendance of specialist services to undertaking personal efforts to change facets in their own lives, there came a point where the facilitation of supervisors could go no further, and the client was required to take action. This chapter concerns itself with the challenge of achieving in clients the first sparks of the motivation to do so: from once again harnessing the client's own aspirations and perspective, to continuing the provision of practical support in their efforts to achieve tangible change.

Part 1 - Fostering Motivation and Providing Nuisance

It was during my early discussions with Morgan about their role as a supervisor that they stressed the importance of client motivation as a criteria for successful meetings. At the most obvious level, they explained, clients simply wouldn't attend specialist services, or act on discussions had and solutions formulated with Morgan, if they were not willing to do so; in the

absence of such willingness, all Morgan believed they could do was "repeatedly nag" clients to externally "nudge", rather than internally motivate, them into some small, basic, practical changes or self-management. As it transpired, the notion of "nagging" clients was more complex than the metaphorical consolation prize of motivation that Morgan depicted it as, but having already demonstrated the centrality of the client contributing their own perspective to the supervision process, it is little surprise that their willing involvement and participation in supervision is a key theme to understanding their interactions with their supervisors.

It was my first sit-in on one of Riley's meetings, and from the description they had given of their client, Paul, it promised to be a complex one. Paul was, to quote Riley, "the kind of guy who hangs on your every word", but actually getting him to carry out any sort of plan or action outside a supervisory meeting was challenging. The goal for this meeting was to get Paul motivated to start tidying and repairing his home, which had been left in a poor state after his latest relapse into alcoholism. After the usual "how are you?" raised no immediate crises, Riley moved the conversation on to Paul's home by asking what colour he was thinking of repainting his walls. Paul initially responded with considerable eagerness, recounting his trip to the DIY store, his colour selection, and even his plans to varnish his floor as well. However, he concluded by saying it was going to be a lot of work and he was "in no rush to get started". Riley nodded appreciatively, agreeing that it was a big project ahead of him, but also expressed a personal sense of admiration for the fact Paul seemed to have a larger plan beyond just painting the walls - even joking that any time they do their own DIY, it was far more "slap-dash". They asked if it'd help Paul to break the entire process down into smaller, individual steps, and when Paul agreed the two spent ten to fifteen minutes planning out the order Paul would paint his rooms, how to varnish the floor, and

even repair some of the cracked and broken ceramic in his bathroom.

In many ways, the foundational dynamic of motivation was similar to that of developing understanding and rapport: that of positive supervisor response nurturing greater client involvement. When a client demonstrated even some small constructive act - whether that be engagement with their supervisor or, as in Paul's case, personal drive towards action outwith their meetings - the supervisor would respond in a personal and positive manner. While Morgan explained it as "using a lot of praise" when clients took a forward step, what supervisors demonstrated in their response was actually a much more complex form of positive reinforcement. Yes, it encouraged clients to carry on with whatever progress they were making, but through the supervisor's expression of personal investment - as with Riley's response to Paul - more than mere praise, it showed care and support for the client. The trick was not to force progress or action, but to nurture whatever small, few steps the client was prepared to take, or had already taken; this means of expression (and any practical advice or assistance rendered alongside) encouraged a reciprocal commitment from the client to further steps.

While Paul served as a more basic example of such further steps, with Riley providing a guided consideration of what Paul wanted to achieve and how to break that goal down into manageable tasks, a deeper interactive effort at motivation was the real goal of both supervisors. In the same vein as the supervisor's investment in clients' progress being reciprocated by a client's increased commitment to that progress, if the supervisor demonstrated a genuine belief in and care for a client, it was hoped that clients would begin to develop their own self-belief and self-care. For example, Martin's transition from a client reluctant to share anything more than a full sentence with Morgan to someone actively discussing his concerns as a parent and his own childhood abuse was paralleled in his growing self-motivation. At the outset of my observational period with Morgan, Martin had just completed a group-work programme, but gave the

clear impression that it had done little to change his outlook; contrastingly, by the time my observational period with Morgan came to an end, Martin was considering counselling sessions to help him address the difficulties he was facing as a parent, alongside his struggle with alcoholism. It was more than coincidence that those two factors were the key thrusts of Morgan's engagement with Martin - reinforcing and validating his positive characteristics as a controlled, caring father, and expressing a sympathetic, non-judgemental concern about his drinking habits. Morgan had not convinced Martin to believe in some novel self-perception or take care of a novel concern; much as above with Paul, Morgan had nurtured nascent facets of Martin's own (self-)perception through external support and encouragement, achieving as a result an (admittedly tentative) internal drive to action.

It is also interesting to note the ways in which supervisors supported clients' growing motivation through simple, pragmatic forms of assistance. While research such as that by King [2013] has tended to find much of a supervisor's time providing practical support is relegated to 'mundane' tasks - filling out forms, making phone calls, writing letters - there is an argument to be made that such simple tasks actually facilitate a supervisor/client dynamic akin to that envisaged by Bottoms and McWilliams' non-treatment paradigm [1979]: a collaborative, client-driven, supervisor-supported practical change effort. Certainly in CPO supervision, such 'mundane' pragmatic assistance served as an opportunity for deeper normative engagement (and thus client motivation): an effective demonstration of care and support, whose positive practical results not only sustained clients' motivational momentum, but encouraged their own growing commitment to change work through the pursuit of further aspirations [Durnescu, 2012]. When supervisors were able, for instance, to call a job centre on a client's behalf to rearrange a meeting, clients indicated that they were not only more likely to attend said meeting because of their supervisor's efforts, but were also more willing to raise other issues for assistance because their supervisor had proved themselves.

This interpersonal dynamic could, however, only catalyse and carry a client's motivation so far; nurturing a client's motivation to take real, meaningful steps forward in both engaging with their supervisor and carry out practical actions beyond the meeting required further effort.

As Keith was still in his late teens, he met the criteria for an intensive (and, from Morgan's account, effective) week-long skills-building programme that took a dozen young men into the countryside for wilderness training and group-work discussion. When Morgan had initially proposed the programme, Keith had agreed in a non-committal fashion: nodding his head and muttering a disinterested "sure, why not". Over the weeks leading up to the programme, Morgan had tried to build Keith's motivation so that he didn't simply "attend", but would actually "participate" in its activities, but this proved difficult. More informal means, such as presenting it as a chance to get out of the city, meet new people and enjoy a week in the country, met with a similar response. It was only in the week prior to Keith leaving for the programme, during which Morgan ran through its itinerary and objectives, that Keith grew appreciably more interested. The idea of developing 'independent living skills' was one that interested him, given his learning difficulties and his ongoing concern that he and his mother would soon be ejected from their current home. By the end of the meeting, while Keith was still cautious and reserved about the programme, he was prepared to admit he was "up for giving it a go" because it "looks alright".

This sort of motivational improvement was the result of Morgan finding a way to make the motivational goal - in this case, the programme - relevant to Keith. In this sense, it was demonstrative of the most common means of making a goal relevant to clients: demonstrating it to have some practical benefit for them. Rather than present its benefit as a nebulous, abstract

improvement to clients' selves and lives, supervisors broke tasks and programmes down into appreciable improvements. Clients were, as a result, more willing to engage with and undertake such efforts because they were intelligible, and beneficial to their ongoing concerns or aspirations. Keith didn't become motivated to participate in the programme when it was presented as a holiday - what good would that do him? - but when presented as, if not a solution to one of his most pressing problems, at least a means of responding to it, then he became interested and willing to at least enter the programme with a desire to see what it had to offer.

The added benefit of such an approach, similar to the process of 'getting to know' a client, was that it could be extrapolated and expanded progressively. Small steps built up to larger goals. If a single programme or action could be understood as carrying some benefit to the client, then that created both a fixed point of reference and the beginnings of a shared vocabulary with which to progress. Paul wanted to fix up his home so he could move away from what he perceived as the squalor associated with his alcoholism; getting his house in order, quite literally, gave him a starting point and sanctuary from which to move forward with his life. Keith wanted to develop a skill set that could help him support his mother; developing those skills was part of his nascent desire to be a responsible, contributing family member. In this sense, finding the benefit that made an action beneficial for a client wasn't a manipulative trick of interaction to secure their performance, but finding a personally profound reason for action that could create a mutuality between the two parties. From a very practical root, this was actually less a process of motivating clients through external forces, and instead a process of discovering a key internal motivation that supervision could support.

Expanding beyond the purely relational interaction between supervisor and client, it is interesting to note how the former stakeholder was able to use the wider context of supervision meetings to further encourage motivation. On numerous occasions, both Morgan and Riley were able to leverage their

positions as supervisors with specialist services, unpaid work projects or even wider local authority bodies to rearrange their clients' meetings if said meetings prevented them from undertaking some positive effort they wanted to pursue (such as voluntarily attending a substance abuse meeting). While, on the surface, there was a very clear and practical effort at ensuring that other elements of a client's CPO don't grow so uncoordinated and complex that it actually hindered client support rather than promote it, there was a more subtle interactional dynamic at work. Clients responded positively to their supervisors reorganising meetings on their behalf, not only in the form of expressions of gratitude, but in subsequently raising further practical issues that either prevented or frustrated their efforts at greater engagement with the CPO, or wider efforts at change-work. Something as simple as lacking the proper work boots for a Job Centre-organised training programme, which might have alternatively been a reason for Bruce not attending the programme, instead became a problem that he sought assistance in solving. Similarly, a specialist programme being slow in responding to a client, which may have frustrated their motivation to eventually attend, could be brought to their supervisor, who would in turn contact the programme themselves. By addressing these small but significant impediments to clients' progress, Morgan and Riley were not only able to facilitate said progress, but demonstrate to clients their ability to assist whenever subsequent challenges threatened to impede their motivation.

This facilitative supervisory stance was particularly noteworthy in how it interfaced with brokered services. While the one-to-one relationship of supervision served a fundamental function as a means of clients raising any feedback issues with services that regularly suffered from over-subscription, lengthy wait times and particular specialisations clients needed to be tailored to fit, supervision also synergised with services on a normative level. Despite their frequent difficulties, specialist services provided expertise skill-sets that supervisors themselves did not possess. However, while a specialist service provided clients with an explicit, focussed programme, supervision continued

to act as a supplemental form of what King [2013] would classify as 'personal development': ensuring client self-confidence was developed and maintained, both in the immediate sense regarding external services, but also with regards to the more long-term motivational goal to which such services were meant to contribute.

Indeed, while King's research notes the primacy of situational response as providing clients a feeling of ownership over their future, this effort was contrastingly pursued in CPO supervision around the alternative: a 'grand plan' of clients' own aspirational goals, serving as the spine for a motivational, optimistic model of desistance [Burnett, 1992]. Far from lacking a sense of ownership, such a plan balanced a clarity of focus and purpose with the client's perception of themselves in an agentic fashion, pursuing their own process of desired change [Maruna, 2001]. Brokered services acted as interventions to support whatever specialist steps were required to achieve that plan, while supervision provided a higher level of ongoing support, both in terms of pursuing further steps in the plan's realisation, but also endeavouring to sustain clients' commitment towards the same. In the latter function, the core interpersonal relationship between client and supervisor can thus be said to draw considerably on pro-social modelling concepts: providing encouragement-based reinforcement for clients whenever small, but appreciable and positive, steps are taken towards both greater engagement with the substance of supervision and, in the process, their own aspirational goals [Rex and Gelsthorpe, 2002].

Rebecca had just begun a specialist service organised for her by Riley that focussed on issues faced by female offenders. Before going into their first meeting since she began the service, Riley described to me their main purpose for the meeting as "progress monitoring", since aside from Rebecca's struggle with alcoholism, she presented several childhood and young-adult traumas that the service was better trained to support. Rebecca was very open when asked what she thought

about the service, explaining that while it did make her anxious, she also felt positive about it. Knowing Rebecca considered her alcoholism to be tied to feelings of stress, Riley emphasised that the service was one whose pace and focus was Rebecca's to determine. "The greatest expert on Rebecca is you," Riley explained, "you need to find what works for you and what you can stick to". Rebecca did then admit that some of the efforts currently being undertaken with her by the service felt overly basic - fundamental life and self-care skills she already possessed - and while she still felt anxious about discussing her trauma, she was interested in the more advanced course the service offered for creative writing as, she explained, a means of self-expression.

What this account demonstrates for the interactional dynamics of client motivation is twofold. Firstly and more specifically, it demonstrates the hierarchical interplay between the supervisor/client relationship and the client's involvement in any external, specialist service. 'Progress monitoring' is a task for supervision, wherein the client can freely express their feelings regarding the service and receive support - whether that be moral or practical - in adapting it to better suit their own perceived needs. Much as just discussed, supervision is constructed, within the wider context of the CPO, as a hub to solve clients' problems; not simply large, lifestyle challenges, but smaller nuisances that disrupt their motivation (in this case, to engage with a specialist service). While the client's motivation is directed towards the service itself, supervision is nevertheless oriented to facilitate that motivation however possible.

But the more complex dynamic occurs within that facilitation, and is made manifest in Riley's comment: "what works for you and what you can stick to". This first facet is linked into one of the first substantive questions asked of clients by both Morgan and Riley during their initial meetings: "where do you want to see yourself in twelve months' time?". Parallel to

developing an understanding of a client's aspirations, goals and assets, this grand plan developed the motivational toolkit for supervisors - the initial indicators of what aspects or services within the CPO would be relevant to, and thus be more likely to achieve the engagement of, an individual client. Whilst the 'getting to know' process allowed clients to readily raise problems they were facing and receive supportive discussion in devising a solution, this served as the opposite-but-complimentary dynamic. In a Janus-like fashion, while the retrospective focus on problem solving (and engaging the client's motivation in that process) was handled by the processes of understanding and rapport, the prospective focus on client self-development (and, again, their motivation in pursuing such) was tied up in this question. It constructed the effort as a personal project, one in which the client led and the supervisor followed in a facilitative capacity, with the similar underpinning logic that an agenda of change derived from the client's own aspirations and terminology would improve their likelihood of active involvement.

There is a notable similarity between this motivational effort and the concept of strengths-based rehabilitation [Lewis, 2005]: a hybridisation of normative engagement and pragmatic assistance achieved through the core focus on what positive contributions a client can make towards their own rehabilitation (with, additionally, some nod towards Lewis' 'rights-based rehabilitation' in its emphasis on client self-determination). Encouraging clients to view, and work towards, some ideal state a year hence, is not only an effort to develop an understanding of their positive characteristics - their aspirations and assets - but to activate those very characteristics as positive, internal drivers for change within clients. In this sense, such a motivational effort actually outstrips comparative probation rationales, such as the Good Lives Model [Ward, 2010], which focus more on a standardised, centralised determination of aspirations and assets, and a consequently oriented 'treatment' approach. Here, by comparison, the client is once again placed at the motivational, and thus motivating, heart of the supervisory interaction: recognised not only as the source of internal information, but the only

stakeholder capable of activating their own motivation. This, in turn, sets out the supervisor's role as, more explicitly, the practical facilitator in helping the client realise their chosen trajectory, but more subtly the encourager and guardian of that motivational drive.

In terms of the significance of these motivational interactions, this effort at encouraging an aspirational, personally-driven effort at lifestyle change by the client has a clear similarity to the 'narrative reconstruction of identity' required for long-term desistance noted by McNeill and Maruna [2008]. Combining the effort to discover and activate a client's underlying motivation with the practical steps to help them achieve desired changes in their lives, supervisors can be seen as encouraging their clients to move away from a self-conceptualisation centred around their offending behaviour, and the wider societal forces contributing to that behaviour. However, on the topic of wider societal forces, in contrast to McNeill and Maruna's work, as well as that of Farrall [2002], there was a distinct absence in these supervisors' modes of motivation: namely, that of developing positive social networks and inclusive reintegration into wider society through social capital and opportunities. This is undoubtedly one of the key challenges of supervision, and indeed the CPO as a whole, but it does leave open the problematic challenge of resting the considerable task of desistance upon the client. In the absence of non-individual change efforts to develop their wider social context, and the challenges it poses, in addition to a lack of meaningful social opportunities, there is the dual risk of clients' aspirational efforts faltering due to a lack of traction, as well as the personal struggle of developing a new identity in an environment that does not support it.

What further complicated this dynamic was the modifier to the supervisors' core comment: not only what works for clients, but what clients can "stick to". In the same way the processes of understanding took place within a wider, pre-constructed supervisor framework that presupposed their ongoing effort to engage the client in developing an understanding of them, so too did this process of prospective client self-development take place

within a similar framework of supervisors safeguarding and maintaining clients' aspirational motivations. Returning to Rebecca, one of Riley's concerns was preserving her involvement with the specialist service from the danger of an anxiety-induced relapse. While the central drive of clients' developmental efforts remained their own aspirations, supervisors strove to erect a protective tunnel around that progress: potential threats, such as alcoholism or anti-social associations, were identified and responded to through suggestions and encouragements intended by the supervisors to side-step or shore up client resilience against those perceived threats.

While such protective efforts did retain some collaborative element to it - supervisors could not, after all, dictate clients' motivations and the actions they took outwith meetings as a result - there was one notable exception. Each client demonstrated a different extent to which they were motivated to involve themselves in supervision and its efforts to support them in working towards aspirational goals, but one universally-shared 'motivational' trait was that of fundamental compliance with the CPO. Typically indicative of early-stage supervision relationships, where understanding and rapport had yet to be built, or in relationships where the supervisor struggled to develop such factors, the emphasis on clients' willingness to adhere to the basic requirements of their Order (i.e. their formal compliance [Robinson and McNeill, 2008]) was achieved by a subtle presentation of non-compliance's consequences. Breach proceedings were not presented by supervisors as a direct threat - comply or be breached, eventually culminating in a return to court - but rather supervisors placed themselves alongside clients in a mutually shared lack of desire towards breaching proceedings. An emotional bridge and personal stake were expressed through notions such as the supervisor having 'failed', and the negative consequences for the client were mirrored by broad indications of the professional ramifications supervisors faced when their clients were subjected to breach proceedings. Supervisors were sincere in saying that they did not want to breach their clients, but framed such instances as client non-compliance necessitating breach

proceedings as some external, objective phenomenon implicitly independent of the supervisors.

This is, arguably, the most significant and critical contrast that can be drawn between these findings and the wider literature regarding the theme of motivation. While in research such as that by Weaver and Armstrong [2011] clients experienced probation as "a supportive, protective structure, a positively experienced constraint on their behaviour, reinforced by the threat of imprisonment" [p16], such a positive perception of constraint was not reflected in CPO supervision. Breach proceedings (and the implicit threat of prison with which all clients associated it) were both presented and perceived as a thing to be avoided. A fail state for both stakeholders, and a threat to the continued progress of supervision. The key variable factor between these two perceptions seems to be that of the supervisor: while Weaver and Armstrong's participants appear to have formulated their own conceptualisation of the threat of imprisonment as an asset that "really made [them] stop and think" (not dissimilar to Duff's morally-communicative punishment [2003a and b]), in these observed interactions the supervisor was far more active in colouring the client's perception of breach proceedings. By focussing on the undesirable consequences, breach proceedings could be constructed as the 'bad cop', whilst similar client engagement would instead be achieved through engagement with the supervisor's 'good cop'.

If clients' motivation did not evolve beyond basic compliance with the requirements of their Order to a more substantive engagement with its actual efforts at support and change, then, I was told by Morgan, the only service that supervisors could really provide was that of 'nagging'. If clients would not develop an internal motivation to pursue their own aspirations through engagement with supervision, then supervision could provide a far less effective external motivating force to ensure some small, practical positive outcomes were achieved. Quality of life improvements such as registering with the local doctor, or cleaning up their homes, could all be achieved with

clients through the simple process of repeatedly asking and encouraging them to do so.

But as my observations with both Morgan and Riley progressed, I noted that this process of 'nagging' was far more complex than the 'Plan B' for unengaged but compliant clients it had been presented as. Even clients who were motivated to set out their own aspirations and undertake real steps in pursuing them were still subject to frequent, repeated suggestions and encouragements in undertaking those practical steps.

One of the recurring recommendations Morgan made to Luke was the importance of registering with a local doctor. Following on from the crisis regarding Luke's ex-partner and her spurious rumours, Luke came into a subsequent meeting with Morgan with another problem: his benefits were being suspended due to his temporary arrest during a prior offence. Morgan was quick to ask what steps Luke needed to take in order to resolve the problem and undo the suspension, and Luke responded that he had a form to complete, but he was currently being halted because one of the required details was his registered doctor. Morgan couldn't help but laugh, saying that they'd been discussing this for three weeks now, and Luke grimly agreed. He explained, somewhat defensively, that he'd been feeling overwhelmed over the past few weeks - between limiting the damage caused by the rumours, and trying to build up his professional connections, he was "just trying to take it a step at a time". Morgan was sympathetic, but that didn't stop them encouraging Luke to register, describing it as something "you've just got to sort out".

Clients' motivation was not an absolute, binary state. They could be sincerely committed to pursuing a course of change-work, but fail to act upon it. Once clients left their supervision meetings, they returned to their ongoing lives, with all the challenges and pre-existing priorities associated with them.

Despite even the most sincere motivations to pursue some course of action, clients were frequently halted by the simple practical limitations of not having enough time, more pressing issues causing them to forget, or emotionally-taxing problems leaving them in a state of inaction. Life, especially complicating contextual factors or ongoing societal challenges faced by clients, got in the way.

This is where 'nagging' entered into the interaction. The repeated asking of whether a client had achieved a particular goal or carried out a promised action, supplemented by the ongoing encouragement to do so if they hadn't, provided a unique incentive for clients that more abstract, normatively motivational engagement couldn't. The supervisor's nagging was a nuisance: a non-hostile 'sting' that didn't exacerbate clients' situations or harm their relationship with the supervisor, but nevertheless gave them a reason to act. Rather than present the action as the fulfilment of some abstract desire, the interactive dynamic of a guaranteed, inexhaustibly repeated query and encouragement sought to stimulate a perceptual shift in clients, wherein the motivation for their action was placed on the same practical level as the factors that had halted it. Acting so as to spare themselves any further nagging could overcome time limitations, prioritisation or emotional drainage in a way that higher, more abstract aspirations simply couldn't.

Perhaps most interestingly, clients both recognised this dynamic of nuisance and appreciated it as another supportive service provided by their supervisor. It was recognised as a positive effort, born from a personal concern and desire to help; in our discussions, Ian called it "a good kick up the ass", explaining that he knew he struggled with motivation (he wanted to change things in his life, but his life got in the way), and as a result having Riley provide him a tangible reason to do so gave him the necessary additional push to overcome his roadblocks.

What this focus on 'nagging' indicates is, once again, the major deficit of supervision: a lack of capacity to address wider societal pressures and

challenges through any medium other than the individual client. While societal factors such as lack of employment, poor housing and anti-social networks are recognised by supervisors as both significant contributors to offending behaviour [Day, 2011], there is no means within either the process of supervisor/client interaction or external service brokerage to address these challenges beyond encouraging clients to address said challenges themselves. While these motivational aspects focus significantly on developing client agency and self-determination with regards to pursuing a positive identity and its associated lifestyle, as McNeill and Weaver have previously noted [2010], what is truly lacking is the means to provide support beyond the purely developmental stage, and assist clients in practically realising their aspirations through non-personal assets and social opportunities.

As a final note, it was interesting to observe that in instances when neither motivational effort - substantive engagement or nagging - succeeded in engaging clients, it was for the same reason: an absence of relevance. It spoke to the paradox inherent to motivational efforts in supervision: that a client could not be externally motivated without some pre-existing internal motivation. What this section has demonstrated is that the essence of supervisors' efforts to encourage client engagement was the search for a shared concept: some point of translation where the supervisor's efforts to support a desistance-based change and the client's own aspirations could co-exist. At the most fundamental level, absent any higher effort, the mutuality that neither stakeholder wanted to see the client breached served as a basic motivation for formal compliance with the CPO's requirements, but in situations where a more substantive bridge between the two could not be found, motivation simply could not be achieved. Unfortunately, once again Christopher serves as the exemplar of a failed supervisor/client relationship, as he alone demonstrated a client with whom his supervisor, Morgan, was unable to discover some facet with which to make supervision relevant to him. In our discussions, he would frequently express the opinion that

supervision was "pointless" - he was only attending because he had to, and that there was "nothing wrong" with him. As a result, much of their meetings was focussed on maintaining the basic requirements of adherence to the CPO, supplemented by Morgan's ongoing efforts to find some such facet with which to activate a more meaningful motivation from Christopher.

Part 2 - Motivation Through Self-Reflection

As already discussed with regards to the 'dunno' factor, a considerable sticking point for client engagement in supervision was the client's own self-perception: typically an emphasis on negative personal facets, difficulties imposed by wider societal deprivation or developmental trauma and other mental health issues, and/or an unwillingness to acknowledge existent or potential positive facets in their lives. While certain issues of client self-perception - particularly those pertaining to mental health - were beyond the capacity of supervision, instead requiring trained specialist support services, one of the key thrusts of supervision's motivational effort was an attempt to encourage client self-reflection in order to change their perceptions and thus engage them more substantively in supervision. According to Morgan, this was part of the ultimate goal of motivation: "empowering clients" by achieving a primarily internalised motivation, allowing them to maintain momentum and resilience in their self-driven change-work following the conclusion of supervision as a source of support and assistance.

Out of all the clients I observed, Luke was perhaps the most socially open and outgoing in his interactions with Morgan. During every meeting, when asked how his past week had been, he would talk at length about his job as a professional DJ, his nights out on the town with his friends, or the few instances of having custody of his children. However, throughout the course of these meetings, while Luke was more than willing to engage in superficial social niceties, when it

actually came to discussing personal matters he became far more reluctant. During one meeting, wherein Morgan was trying to encourage him to attend a group-work programme, Luke didn't simply refuse to attend, but claimed he couldn't; he didn't have the confidence to talk about his feelings "in front of a bunch of strangers". Over the course of the next two meetings, Morgan's primary effort was trying to address this lack of confidence: Luke was always talking about his onstage antics in front of a hundred Saturday-night club-goers, so how could he not have the confidence to go to group-work. "That's a stage persona", Luke answered, "not the real me". In investigating the difference in self-perception, it emerged that what Luke really struggled with was classroom environments: as a high school dropout, Luke struggled in formal educational settings, which not only discouraged him from engaging in group-work, but was holding him back from aspirations of pursuing a business qualification to improve his DJing career. Unfortunately my observational period with Morgan ended shortly after this revelatory meeting, but in our final discussions Morgan described their intentions to work through Luke's reasons for struggling in classrooms, and potentially run some practice encounters to build his confidence.

The core of this effort at self-reflection was to discover and harness a key facet of the client's self-perception, namely, their dissatisfaction at their current identity. Often, much like the 'getting to know' process, this presented initially as practical symptoms - Luke's reluctance to engage in group-work, or Keith's preoccupation with his family's housing situation - but hinted at a more deep-set normative difficulty. The supervisor's role was, once they were able to leverage their rapport to encourage clients to open up, to discover some alternative perspective the client demonstrated in a different, but sufficiently similar, situation. This was not to provide a simplistic solution (i.e. 'act like you would in the alternative situation'), but to encourage the client to

reflect on what key variable in their self-perception existed to distinguish the two. In setting out that variable, the client set out the issue for the supervisor to address, and in framing it as the distinguishing factor between their problematic situation and one in which clients enjoyed a more positive self-perception, supervisors sought to motivate clients to begin tackling it. As Morgan described it to me, "something in their lives clearly isn't working for them", and in presenting it thusly to clients they were encouraged to do something about it. This, then, was the first stage of empowerment: identifying, isolating and excising the source of clients' negative self-perception.

It is, at this stage, crucial to emphasise that the interactional dynamic between supervisor and client here was indeed one built around self-reflection and autonomous change. The risk with this depiction of encouraging self-awareness in clients is that it can be construed as a particularly advanced form of manipulation: utilising external pressure and contextual power to alter a client's self-perception in such a way as to achieve a desired outcome (i.e. a reduction in their risk of reoffending, and potentially steps towards initial desistance). While Morgan and Riley made explicit their willingness to provide simple, practical support to clients who did not wish to engage in such reflective behaviour, that does not alter either their efforts to encourage such engagement or the potential interpretation of it as a process of re-engineering the client's subjective perspective.

Thus it is important to return to the initial conceptualisation of this reflective process: "empowering". While that is how Morgan conceptualised their efforts, clients expressed it in a simpler term: "learning". Not training or drilling in a particular course of law-abiding behaviour, but an opportunity to explore the issues they faced, how those issues impacted their actions, and the harmful consequences they suffered as a result. Offending behaviour was not reduced down to the simplistic denominator of pure choice, but supervisors sought to impress upon clients their own agency, both within the supervisory process and in wider life. "He's helping me sort myself out", Ian

explained to me, and the terminology was telling: once again, the client was central, but now not only as the motivating force for the supervisory process, but the key actor as well. Unlike in the 'getting to know' process, where client-provided information drove a supervisory response, here supervisor-provided stimuli drove a client response. Beyond the simplistic claim that clients could only change if they chose to do so, what is far more important is the openness of that choice: supervisors did not present a singular, desired alternative to their current state of affairs, but worked to facilitate the client's own self-exploration of why they were dissatisfied with that state, and from that point moved forward into what could be changed and how. In many instances, this tied into the early discussions of their aspirations: where they wanted to see themselves in twelve months. Keith wanted to become a responsible "man of the house", with a job-based income to support his mother and the skills to help her around the home; Luke wanted to cultivate a DJing business, moving from playing one-off gigs to organising his own events. Both had facets of their lives, and their own selves, holding them back from these aspirations. Motivation, therefore, was not about removing them from one 'negative' path and placing them on a standardised, predetermined 'positive' path; it was about discovering and harnessing a client's own dissatisfaction. Substantive engagement with supervision was not hooking clients on to an objective change effort by engineering their own self-perspective, but finding their own subjective motivation and engineering supervision to facilitate their desired change.

Speaking broadly, this effort by the supervisor to engage client motivation through a reflective process can be understood as an advancement on the research-recognised importance of supervision as a 'secondary supportive service' to clients' own desistance journey [Fenton, 2013]. Indeed, this reflective approach would seem to reconcile, or at least offer a tentative solution, to the anxiety Fenton argues would arise from increased autonomy, discretion and individual responsibility required by supervisors to achieve such a desistance approach to supervision. Reflection

is a means of normative engagement that engages the client, quite literally, on their own terms; while, in a parallel to the 'getting to know' process, there is a subsequent act of interpretation by the supervisor in determining whether the subject matter is an asset to be developed, or a problem to be addressed, this may actually prove an advantage of the dynamic. Such an interpretive checkpoint might be viable to demonstrate the necessary 'due diligence' and practice in a system still concerned with risk management, at least as a means of managerial self-protection, whilst still pursuing welfarist goals with their clients in a still-largely dynamic, responsive model.

In terms of this dynamic model, reflection demonstrates a consistent vindication of discussion as an effective intervention process. Drawing on McCulloch's research [2005] into clients' accounts of supervision and its most useful elements, the importance of "being listened to" and "talking about social problems and receiving advice and guidance" cannot be overstated [p15]. Of particular importance is McCulloch's noting of the link between these two facets: that the experience of having someone interested in a client's own account increases their likelihood of engaging with any subsequent effort at developing a response but, even more importantly, the process of discussion enabled "a process of problem clarification and identification" [p16] that empowers clients to better understand and address facets of their own lives. The interpersonal interaction in CPO supervision discussed above would therefore seem to expand upon this catalytic ability, and tie it into the increased likelihood of consequent client motivation. The process of exploring challenges and aspirations, and the realisation by clients of their own agency in the different ways they might proceed, increased their willingness to engage with subsequent plans of action because they have an ownership over such plans.

In discussing the interactive dynamics between supervisor and client, however, especially in an area so personally sensitive as the client's own reflection, the issue of power is an inescapable challenge. As already noted in the more general discussion on supervisor/client literature, work such as

that by Porporino and Fabiano [2008] and Trotter [2008] indicate worrying potentials for supervision to smuggle externally-engineered client change into the client's own experience of supervision under the guise of their own internal development. Here, in the process of encouraging client reflection, with its focus on identifying facets in their lives that 'don't work', there is a danger that such interaction was little more than wrapping pre-packaged, pre-determined interventions in the trappings of the client's subjective experiences. In many ways, the only redress against this concern is a matter of personal faith in the individual supervisors, and bears a certain similarity to the anxiety Fenton [2013] notes regarding the place of discretion and individual responsivity within supervisor/client dynamics. As has been stressed throughout this section, the focus throughout such motivational, reflective interactions was on highlighting and enhancing a client's own agency; of impressing upon them not a single solution, but an open potentiality of their own solutions. The core assumption of motivation - that it can only be freely achieved by a willing client - breaks down when one factors in the ethically-questionable manipulation that certain accounts of case management or pro-social modelling imply; by contrast, the interactive dynamics of CPO supervision did not seek to fix clients to a single motivational track towards a given outcome, but to maintain an almost quantum state of possibility and shape supervision around a client's chosen path.

This effort towards harnessing clients' self-perceptions did, however, possess another ethically complex facet: while considerable effort in supervisor/client interactions was invested in a constructive, prospective motivation towards future aspirations, that is not to say past actions (i.e. clients' offending behaviour) did not factor into the motivational model as well.

All clients expressed, at one point or another, a sense of regret regarding their offending behaviour, but typically characterised it as a sense of regret over "acting stupidly" and "getting caught". Some

clients, such as Keith, exhibited a far deeper reaction to their past behaviour. Following on from his marked opening up to Morgan, the two began to increasingly discuss Keith's former peer group and their influence on his prior breaking and entering. Keith was emphatic in stating that while he still hung out with this group, he'd been trying to discourage them from breaking into any more houses. The consequent eviction of his own family from their home had helped him realise, he explained, what it feels like to have someone "screw with" one's home life. He used to think it was fine breaking into the houses of those richer than he was - "they could afford to lose a bit" - but now he "kinda know[s] how it feels". Morgan nodded along, stating how impressed they were at Keith's effort to be more responsible with his friends. While Morgan made no moral judgement about Keith's past behaviour, they did reinforce Keith's own realisation: he has developed a sense of empathy with his victims, and that helped him reflect on his actions from a different perspective.

Although instances of it were rare, when clients exhibited a sense of remorse or guilt over their offending behaviour, this became a powerful reflective tool that supervisors used as a supplementary source of motivation - not towards any aspirational goal, but away from any potential repeat of that behaviour. Supervisors did not attempt to compound clients' negative emotions, or express any sort of punitive or judgemental response; clients had already reached their own reflective conclusion, and their expressions of remorse were the result of that. What supervisors instead responded with was an effort to harness those negative expressions, making explicit the association between them and the behaviour to which they pertained. Clients would, as a result, express a desire to avoid such feelings again by avoiding such behaviour in the future - frequent expressions were that they wanted to "do better" or "stick to the straight and narrow".

Once again, supervisors sought to harness clients' own perspectives

to achieve a similarly internal motivation. In this instance, that motivation was a negative - the drive to not do something. Such an effort is, of course, ethically questionable, raising shades of Pavlovian conditioning in supervisors' efforts to explicate the association between clients' negative emotional states and the actions that gave rise to them, even straying into a quasi-moralistic variant of the Panopticon, where behavioural self-control is maintained not through an internalised sense of being monitored, but through an internalised avoidance of further such emotional states. While there is nothing that can be said to challenge the inherent problematic quality of such an effort, it is important to stress two facets of the interactive dynamics that occurred between supervisor and client when expressions of such guilt or remorse were expressed.

Firstly, there is the fact that such expressions were made under the client's own free impetus. In the exchange of interactive moves, amidst all the forms of query and encouragement that supervisors proffered, there was no effort to elicit or catalyse such a response. Both Morgan and Riley stated that they were not "in the judgement business", and that their ideal state of preventing client recidivism was to focus on helping them construct a "positive future", rather than dwell on negative past behaviour. Thus it was clients themselves who initialised such interactions and, as Keith's example demonstrates, said interactions were not geared towards guiding or shaping their emotional responses; clients had already completed their reflection, and supervisors instead focussed on solidifying the already-extant link between action and consequence.

Secondly, and perhaps not as explicit in Keith's example, were the efforts undertaken by supervisors to express some positive lining to clients' reflections. When, for instance, Martin discussed his own remorse over his offending and the strain that had put on his relationship with his children, Morgan was quick to emphasise Martin's own strength and agency in tackling the alcoholism that underpinned his offending behaviour. Both supervisors strove to place clients' guilt and remorse not only in context with the

behaviour that caused it, but in clients' subsequent efforts to move forward from it. While their emotional reactions were reasons to avoid such behaviour in the future, they were not cages that trapped clients in a fixed, negative definition. Supervisors were quick and emphatic to respond in ways that emphasised positive growth, the potential for change and the importance of clients' agency in achieving both.

This is, perhaps, the closest CPO supervision comes to a notion of punishment, or at least elements of supervisor/client interaction germane to the significance of punishment within such interaction. It is important, although comparatively obvious, to distinguish this facet of the dynamic from explicitly punitive interactions - the goal of the supervisor in these instances is not to impose 'rigour' or 'discipline' upon the client [Mair and Canton, 2007], nor is it to harness whatever pain (in this case, emotional) they are experiencing for the sake of public punitive desires [Pamment and Ellis, 2010; Robinson and Ugwudike, 2012]. However, even compared against more gentle, constructive interpretations of punishment's role within the supervisory dynamic, these interactions do not seem to meet the necessary criteria for comparison. Duff's theory of secular penance [2003a and b], for instance, would require the supervisor to express that the client has committed a wrong, and that the supervisory process is a means to make right that wrong and relieve the moral debt to society the client has accrued. This narrative is clearly not present in the CPO supervision interactions observed: supervisors do not focus on the offending incident itself unless guided there by clients' discussions, and certainly step carefully so as not to even imply a negative moral judgement of the actions carried out, nor is the process of support and intervention that takes place during supervision framed with any allusion to penance (secular or otherwise), moral redemption or reparation. By contrast, when clients do present their own expressions and experiences of guilt and remorse, the goal supervisors appear to be working towards is a much more basic, behavioural one: an apposite, 'anti-social' modelling as it were, harnessing the client's own perspective to avoid

similarly risky behaviour in the future. King [2013], for instance, discusses research findings wherein supervisors harnessed clients' feelings of remorse or regret over their actions (or their negative consequences) to catalyse the initial stages of desistance: questioning their accepted normative foundations and making a conscious, decisive change in behaviour. Such a model seems particularly pertinent, given the complimentary emphasis on clients' prospective ambitions; achieving desistance on the one hand by harnessing clients' moral agency (i.e. negative feelings) to deter them from further offending, whilst constructing positive future ambitions around which to orientate them.

In this sense, such a dynamic actually errs closer to the dangers of responsibilisation, placing the client in the conceptual position of one whose offending behaviour is a product of bad choices, norms and other factors pertaining to personal responsibility, rather than wider structural inequalities [Kemshall, 2002]. That being said, it is important to stress the wider context of supervisor/client interactions, and the focus on (or, at least, sensitivity towards) such wider, external challenges would rather indicate a tentative effort at balancing such societal inequalities with an effort at promoting clients' own agency in addressing them (not dissimilar to the social psychological model of rehabilitation [McNeill, 2009] - causes of crime are environmental, but individuals have active choice in how they engage with those environmental pressures).

If there is one fully valid criticism of such an interactive dynamic, and indeed the wider effort at reflective motivation, it is the narrow scope of how clients' agency is conceptualised. While individual choice is of course a crucial factor, it is a well noted reality that structure is capable of either enabling or limiting such choice [King, 2012]. It is vital to recognise that, especially in a model of supervision that pursues nascent desistance objectives, in the absence of interventions capable of generating social opportunities to realise long-term desistance, client reflection and motivation can only go so far in overcoming the societal inequalities and criminogenic

deprivations they face. As has already been seen with the necessity of 'nagging' as a practical supplement for client motivation, and as will be seen in the challenges of supervisor/client problem solving, a highly individualised focus on the client as their own vehicle for change, while agentic, places considerable pressure upon said client to oppose profound societal challenges, many of which cannot be solely overcome by either aspirational effort or personal reflection.

In discussing situations in which this reflective effort at motivation was not reciprocated by clients, there is an obvious similarity with the aforementioned 'dunno' factor - namely, clients proving unwilling to reflect upon matters they do not wish to consider. In such instances, the 'dunno' factor is still applicable, but this particular method of engagement demonstrated a different reason for such interactions failing: an incompatibility of perceptual stances.

One of the assumptions I caught myself making early on in my observations of supervision meetings was that the capacity to self-reflect was a given. What I came to realise was that such a capacity was merely part of my perceptual stance, especially as a researcher, and that the way others, particularly clients, viewed external stimuli and processed it into their subjective realities could differ drastically from my own. Some clients, in the simplest terms, perceived their world differently, focussing more on cognitive and emotional responses to immediate or ongoing issues, facilitating situational reaction rather than reflection. David, for instance, was once asked what he thought of the fact that several of his acquaintances from the gang with whom he used to steal motorbikes were in prison, and one was dead because of a road traffic collision. David replied that he didn't think much about it; he'd been sad during the funeral, but otherwise "it just happened". While Riley had been attempting to encourage some reflection on the potential dangers of such a lifestyle in order to motivate some move away from it, this effort failed because David's perceptual stance didn't factor in such retrospective considerations. While some of the facets of motivation

already discussed, especially the encouragement of choice and agency in responding to situations and pursuing aspirations, could nurture a more reflective stance, this was a slow process of development. In the interim, supervisors and such clients were as good as talking across each other, approaching the same situation from different perspectives without any meaningful commonality with which to create some shared understanding.

Motivating - 'What Works' For Clients

It is, perhaps, little surprise that supervisor/client interactions focussed on motivation rely heavily upon the client's own perspective to determine the intersubjective reality of their relationship. But it is the extent of this reliance, and its particular nature, that is of particular interest. At the outset of this chapter, the simple relational dynamic of internalisation-by-encouragement was discussed: supervisors positively reinforcing small steps by clients, or positive motivational stances of belief and care, in an effort to translate temporary external motivation into a more long-term, personal drive towards change. Such motivation would, on its own, conjure a particular image of the intersubjective reality of supervision: the supervisor pushing the client forward, building up sufficient momentum through directed, positive reinforcement until the client is capable of sustained forward progress under their own power. Such a reality would be far from the collaborative, constructive efforts already envisioned in the complex dynamics of developing understanding with a client, and indeed would be altogether closer to supervisor's perspective of what 'nagging' meant. An ongoing, admittedly pro-social, effort to achieve action on the client's part, with the client's only option being inaction, in which case they are subjected to further effort, or compliant behaviour. Such a reality would, on its own, make something of a mockery of substantive compliance - externally engineered engagement with the core subject-matter of supervision, rather than willing and invested involvement.

Thus the importance of client relevancy emerges as a bridging point: undertaking a sincere effort to find some hook that links supervision's effort at a prototypical long-term desistance with the client's own goals, concerns and priorities. Such an effort profoundly alters the intersubjective reality of motivation from a unilateral, driving push to a shared exploration of the client and the options available to them. "What works for you" emphasises that, while it may be the supervisor taking the interactive initiative in positing both potential courses of action and reasons for so acting, the client retains a significant power: only they can make that link of relevancy, and in so doing activate their own motivation to action. Within this intersubjective effort, reflection is a key component, furthering the emphasis on the client's own perspective, this time not on the various interventions available but on the focus of those interventions: themselves. Reflection allows clients to set the terms of their own problems and aspirations, and in so doing shape the vital details of their dynamic not only with their supervisors, but the wider CPO as well.

It is this emphasis on clients as agentic actors that positions the CPO so interestingly in relation to existing research. It is, for instance, the distinguishing factor when contrasted with the Good Lives Model [Ward, 2010] which, despite a similar strengths-based, aspirational focus, is more standardised and assessment-driven than grounded in facilitating the client's own vision. On the other hand, it seems to hint at a deeper value to the acknowledged importance of discussion to intervention processes [McCulloch, 2005]: not simply talking and being listened to, but having one's perspective taken forward as the defining template for supervision.

That is, of course, not to say that this dynamic is without problems. While the key word for supervisors in this process was 'empowerment', the other side to the 'what works for you' coin - 'what you can stick to' - does warp the intersubjective reality between them and their clients. While client agency has been a repeated theme in this chapter, emphasising a freedom of self-determination in both exploring their own dissatisfactions, ambitions and

options in addressing both, the supervisor's (understandable) concern with acting as a sentinel over clients' nascent motivation to action injects a unilateral, control aspect into supervision. One of the aforementioned benefits of this agentic approach is its avoidance of more prescriptive, unilateral, treatment-esque approaches to client intervention and engagement; what this protective stance risks inviting is that self-same approach as a second-order precaution to safeguard clients' progress against what are, essentially, risk factors to themselves.

Beyond this, the intersubjective reality demonstrated by these motivational efforts does have two distinct limitations. The first is that of breach dynamics, used in supervision as part of a dichotomisation that burdens the impersonal, mechanical aspects of a client's CPO with all the negative associations of formal compliance, threat of imprisonment, etcetera, whilst freeing the interpersonal relationship between client and supervisor to focus on positive, constructive dynamics. In addition to simply being a false dichotomy - it is still supervisors themselves who initiate breach proceedings - such a division of labour reduces breach proceedings down to a looming threat, rather than recognising its effect on clients and harnessing that towards a constructive motivation.

And, finally, there is the repeatedly demonstrated limitation of supervision's individualisation of the client. Research acknowledges the fact that agency is not absolute; context is a key determinant of choice [Day, 2011; King, 2012]. The challenges faced in this chapter would not only support such an acknowledgement, but provide a crucial illustration of the symptoms that arise when this challenge is encountered by an agency-centric intervention effort. The intersubjective reality established by supervisor and client is one that is, while far from blind to the wider societal inequalities and absence of social opportunities the client faces, certainly incapable of addressing them in a meaningful fashion. Thus the critical position of 'nagging' as a supplementary service provided by the supervisor - the only way, within such a highly individualised matrix, that these wider

challenges can be 'addressed'.

Chapter 7 - Problem Solving

While both preceding chapters have already discussed problem solving in relation to its practical involvement in supervisor/client interactions geared towards either developing understanding or motivation, the sheer quantity of time, effort and attention invested by both stakeholders in this element of supervision merits its own chapter as a standalone theme. While quantification is not a component of this research, the fact that the majority of every supervision meeting was dedicated to some aspect of what supervisors termed 'problem solving' - from the day to day, pressing issues raised by the supervisor's opening 'how're you doing?', to deeper criminogenic risk factors and needs - indicates its essential nature in understanding CPO supervision.

Problem solving, as is no doubt already clear, was one of the primary lenses through which supervisor/client interactions took place. Efforts to develop understanding or client motivation did not take place in abstract, but rather were grounded in daily or ongoing, in-depth challenges that clients brought to their supervisors. And, similarly, efforts at enabling clients to address and manage their risks and needs, or make constructive progress towards an aspirational lifestyle, made practical use of clients' contextual situations as obstacles to be overcome, or tools to improve or harness clients' own perspectives.

While problem solving was often a reactive enterprise, with clients raising pressing issues for supervisory support, or supervisors attempting to mitigate some facet of the client's behaviour or context that risked leading to breach or reoffending, that is not to say it could not attempt deeper, more complex efforts at engagement and change at the same time. Even in instances where it did serve a purely instrumental objective of maintaining the status quo of supervision, this theme demonstrates critical insights into the priorities and challenges of the supervisory relationship.

Part 1 - Handling Symptoms vs. Addressing Causes

From an early point in Morgan and Martin's meetings it was clear that many of the problems Martin was facing in his life had a strong causal link to his childhood: from his alcoholism to the offending behaviour carried out whilst intoxicated, and even his own personal difficulties in developing positive familial relationships, all the challenges discussed in his supervisory meetings could be traced back to severe childhood abuse and neglect at the hands of his parents. However, until Martin himself directly raised his childhood as a key contributor to his current behaviour, that was not the focus of supervision meetings' understanding, motivational or problem-solving efforts. Especially with regards to the lattermost theme, emphasis was instead placed by Morgan upon immediate, pressing, more tangible problems. "I'm not here to drag you back into the past; I want to help you deal with the problems you're facing right now", Morgan said in one early meeting, and much of their dynamic was built around this claim. Martin had identified his alcoholism as both a personal challenge he wanted to address, as well as the key determinant of his offending, and so Morgan regularly checked in with Martin regarding the frequency, quantity and patterns of his drinking, his thoughts and feelings as to why he drank, and his reactions after he had sobered. From this the two were able to build a picture of Martin's habits - typically drinking when his mood was poor, or he was bored - and by emphasising the regret he invariably felt after an evening or more of heavy intoxication, Morgan was able to encourage Martin to think ahead, realise he'd feel that way, and choose to address the reason he was drawn to alcohol rather than succumb to its influence.

There's an interesting paradox to this account of Martin's alcoholism. The whole process of unpacking the problem, developing an understanding of its conditions, triggers and consequences, was all to build up an

understanding of the problem's causes so as to enable Martin to behave in a different way that avoided the symptom. Drinking was a symptom of particular mental states, and so different behaviour to avoid or curb those states lessened the risk of drinking. A largely cognitive-behavioural approach to problem solving, this strategy found the mental cause of the problem-symptom in question and sought to alter the client's behaviour so as to prevent it; a process, in this case, enhanced by the interactive emphasis on harnessing the client's own reasoning to act differently (specifically, Martin's post-drinking feelings of regret at succumbing to his alcoholism).

And yet, when one considers the wider context of this particular interaction, it becomes clear that the entire problem of Martin's drinking was, itself, a symptom of a much deeper and more complex problem born from his childhood trauma. Given the still-nascent rapport Morgan possessed with Martin at this stage in their relationship, such a micro-focus could then be further interpreted as a deliberate interactive approach: focussing not only on an issue that Martin himself was already self-motivated to address (i.e. that had a predetermined relevancy that could be capitalised upon), but one that was practical and practicable. Not an abstract, 'back in your past' challenge that not only required considerably greater client motivation to open up regarding, but a much more developed approach to address. This problem was one whose practical mechanics could be broken down through discussion, and a logical cause-effect-reaction dynamic could be used to develop a solution. Rather than simply a low-hanging fruit, however, this particular problem solving effort was also developmental. It built rapport and motivation both by demonstrating the capacity for supervision to assist in developing realisable solutions, but also starting to lay the foundations to address that more abstract, normative challenge behind the symptom being dealt with. Martin's own discussion of his drinking allowed him to open up and begin to touch upon much deeper facets of his normative self (that is to say, the 'norms' - values, beliefs, key self-perceptions, etc. - that underlay his actions): the link between drinking and negative mental states, the fact that

he retrospectively perceived his drinking as a thing to regret, and his effort to control his alcoholism around his children. All these factors re-emerged later when he was finally ready to raise, on his own initiative, what he perceived to be the root cause of his problems. This initial, far more practical effort at handling his symptomatic alcoholism had set a conceptual repertoire from which Martin was able and willing to construct and address its deeper cause.

As my observations with Morgan and Riley continued, it became increasingly clear that there was a subtle, two-track process to problem solving. The first, more explicit process identified immediate, practical problems typically associated with a client's risk factors, responding to them with solution strategies that sought to harness clients' own perspectives to promote agency in choosing alternative behaviours (which, as a result, enabled a more open and empowering model of self-control/risk-management). The second was slower and more developmental, utilising the self-reflection clients demonstrated in the first to build both a shared and a personal understanding of the deeper, criminogenic problems underlying clients' immediate challenges and risk factors, utilising the relationship dynamic between them and their supervisor both to build willingness to discuss these more sensitive matters, but also provide demonstrable terms with which clients could describe and explore much more complex issues and their influences.

This initial, practical problem solving was seen as a key focus in supervision - the classic 'how was your week?' opening to most supervision meetings was frequently met with open expressions of novel or ongoing problems in clients' daily lives for which they were eager to discuss and formulate solutions with their supervisor. But in Morgan's own words, "fixing people's problems can't be the end of it" - the root causes of those problems needed to be addressed, and that required far more in-depth intervention, ranging from resilience-building, positive asset acquisition and agentic development to the brokerage of specialist services to address abuse, mental health issues and other such challenges. The real challenge, though, was in

finding the necessary available time to address the root causes between these weekly problems.

Context was, perhaps, the most significant influencer of supervisor/client interactions when it came to problem solving; namely, the facets of a client's lifestyle that they brought into supervision meetings to discuss, that impacted their involvement with other CPO requirements or brokered specialist services, or hindered their personal efforts at pursuing change-work. This lattermost facet, regarding clients' lives outwith the CPO, has already been discussed in light of supervisors' 'nagging' techniques - the necessity for supervisors to engineer a practical impetus for clients to make appreciable progress in their own self-development and change whilst being subjected to societal challenges and pressures in their social lives.

The foremost facet, in turn, is relatively simple in its impact upon supervisor/client interactions, but no less challenging for it. Supervision meetings were finite events, lasting anywhere from twenty to sixty minutes depending upon the agendas and concerns of both parties, and given the typical opening inquiry made by supervisors, immediate practical problems being faced by clients would take priority in discussion. Time that could be spent discussing the deeper issues underlying those practical problems was consequently eaten up by those very same practical problems being addressed.

This brings us to the third and final contextual challenge: those issues influencing a client's involvement with other CPO requirements and brokered specialist services. Supervisors, as previously explored, perceived supervision as serving a meta-level function within the CPO, acting as a nexus wherein the supervisor could help clients arrange, manage and reflect upon all other facets of their CPO and its associated interventions, tying it all together into a nascent desistance project. This meant that, in addition to meetings' finite time being taken up by practical problems clients brought to them, it was also taken up by similar issues that impacted clients' involvement in other requirements or services. Despite the strain this put on

meetings' schedules, however, this approach did have the distinct advantage of allowing supervisors and clients to unpack what might otherwise have been dealt with as issues of simple non-compliance. Rather than a client simply not turning up to unpaid work, or attending a counselling session, and being breached or remonstrated for their failure, supervisors approached the matter with the same effort at in-depth, personal understanding as any other problem. As a result, supervisors were often able to collaboratively address either practical issues (typically transportation, finances or medical conditions) or deeper normative problems (Luke's struggle with formal education models and environments, for instance) that were hindering client engagement. Rather than censuring negative behaviour, discussion allowed supervisors and clients to address the underlying cause of that behaviour and thus remove both as problems - a neat microcosm of the entire problem solving effort.

This model of client engagement and empowerment raises what has been, and will continue to be, a recurring issue throughout this study's supervision interactions. While the centrality of the client as an individual has demonstrated numerous advantages, there is the danger of it being interpreted, according to LeBel et al.'s typology of individual agency vs. social context [2008], as 'strong-subjective'. As King notes [2012], such centrality raises the concerning implication that both the ability and onus of change rests solely upon the individual client, and thus failure to achieve desistance is interpreted as a lack of will or sincere motivation on the client's part.

This was, of course, not the case in the interactions herein observed. The perspectives held by both supervisors and clients was much closer to that of LeBel et al.'s 'subjective-social' type, wherein indeed a client's own ability to choose and pursue desired change was necessary, but of equal value were pragmatic support and structural changes in their social context to enable and realise that change. The issue arose in that this perspective was not reflected in the ultimate social reality achieved between the two stakeholders: because of limited resources and assets, only the initial step of

client empowerment could be taken, leading to what McNeill and Whyte [2007] might define as an instance of 'dissonance', wherein individual clients were motivated towards achieving desistance, but lacked employment, relationships and other pro-social assets to realise their motivation. Programmes to help build human capital were limited, with organisations such as the Job Centre relied upon remotely to help make clients employable, while despite sensitivity to clients' social contexts there was a distinct lack in either resources or connections to resources that could provide supportive social capital.

In the absence of means to develop human and social capital, there was little the supervisor could do other than encourage a change in attitude and self-perception - willing and prepared to change, but without the subsequent 'hooks' to make it happen [Giordano et al., 2002]. Much of the interactions discussed in previous chapters regarding normative engagement readily fit into desistance notions of identity transformation [Paternoster and Bushway, 2009], but the strategies set in place to achieve that transformation could only truly rely on what the client was able to do on their own, supported to whatever extent the supervisor's own limited assets were able to provide. As King notes [2012], the efforts undertaken by supervision were more than simply identifying desired changes and goals, but developing 'workable means of achieving these aspirations' [p331]; what was lacking were alternative plans in the face of contextual obstacles and the absence of resources with which to address them. And, similar to King's own research findings, the strategies were highly conventional - employment, family, etc. - but the opportunities to realise such aspirations were unavailable (with King's research offering a pessimistic prognosis as to the consequences of such a situation).

However, the problem solving process was not always a smoothly collaborative (albeit often limitedly successful) undertaking between supervisor and client. While the aforementioned process did typically raise problems, both practically immediate and underlying normative, that clients

wanted to solve, situations did arise in supervision meetings where supervisors would perceive some facet of a client's lifestyle as problematic and seek to persuade an unconvinced or unwilling client to address it.

Towards the end of my observation period with Riley, they and Bruce, one of Riley's more challenging clients, devoted an entire meeting to discussing money issues and how Bruce might better manage his income, expenditures and budget. After several minutes of confusion regarding Bruce's considerable mobile phone tariff, it was eventually revealed that Bruce had, on a monthly basis, been taking out contracts on the latest phone models, utilising them for the month, before pawning the handset and voiding the contract. Shocked, and making no attempt to hide their disapproval, Riley then asked Bruce why he didn't just buy a cheap, pay-as-you go shell-phone, rather than rack up costly bills (and potential law suits) with this ill-conceived pawning scheme. Bruce attempted to defend his actions, claiming that his girlfriend had "expensive taste" and "wouldn't date a guy without a proper phone". Riley did not accept that as an excuse, rebutting that Bruce needed to take responsibility for his actions and get this problematic cycle of behaviour under control, before hefty bills became the least of his worries.

'Responsibility' was an infrequent theme in the process of problem solving, but proved a crucial one in situations like Bruce's problematic phone scheme. When clients such as Bruce weren't willing to acknowledge or address a problem as a problem, 'responsibility' was the key term deployed by their supervisor in an attempt to change their perspective. The clear implication, such as in Bruce's situation, was that a client's current behaviour was 'irresponsible' - demonstrating a lack of self-control and foresight as to the negative consequences of the behaviour in question - and that solving the problem would require a commensurate change (typically backed up by

the supervisor spelling out the negative consequences to give the client a relevant reason to so change). This judgement against a projected, objective standard was reinforced by a moral, subjective response: the supervisor demonstrating a degree of personal disapproval or disappointment in the client (whilst maintaining the core framework of support and assistance), leveraging their rapport so as to construct the client's 'responsible' change as the means of re-establishing the positive quality of their shared relationship.

Similar to the theme of motivation, this notion of 'responsibility' arose from the supervisor recognition that clients would not address problems if they did not see them as such. In the same way that action towards collaboratively solving a practical problem could help build the skill-set to address deeper problems, 'responsibility' also served as a bridge between the two levels of problem solving. While the solutions to more immediate problems, such as Bruce's phone scheme, were made relevant to clients by an explication of the negative consequences, so that the client would be persuaded to address the problematic behaviour so as to avoid those consequences, that in turn fed into a deeper normative project. 'Responsibility' was a normative guideline with an implicit criterion that, as it was invoked by supervisors, encouraged clients to reconsider other behaviours or deeper facets of their lives that they, perhaps, should reconsider as problematic as well. While some clients may have sought their own aspirational goals, through which problems had to be solved in order to achieve those goals, for other clients 'responsibility' was a base-line standard for which supervisors sought to prepare them. Self-control was a key hallmark of this standard, but that in itself was merely a product of a deeper, normative ability to measure choices according to resilience/desistance criteria: what options would be more likely to promote a positive, sustainable lifestyle? By the end of my observational period, for example, Bruce had begun to express a growing discomfort with the influence his girlfriend had over him - an influence he was beginning to regard as negative, given the 'irresponsible' behaviour that he performed to impress her.

Although this theme of 'responsibility' in supervisor/client interactions does not fully embrace the responsabilisation concept found within correctionalist signification, there are discomfoting similarities: the association of dangerous behaviour with individual deficit, and the need for intervention to manage that danger and defuse the risk it poses [McNeill, 2004]. What was distinct in this regard is that the dangerous behaviour did not pose a risk to the public (the more common justification for redressing client deficits), but rather to the clients themselves - it was self-responsibility that was being impressed, but which still raises the spectre of educated, enforced compliance. After all, the client's perspective needed to be altered to recognise the problem as such, and respond to it in an appropriate manner; compliance had to be internalised. It is interesting, to draw further upon McNeill's argument, to note that in instances where 'responsibility' was invoked as interactional leverage to change clients' behaviour, the key tenets of listening to the offender and valuing their perspective (hallmarks of the nascent desistance paradigm supervision otherwise followed closely) were temporarily paused in favour of more objectifying interaction. The client's deficit - their 'irresponsible' perspective, however that manifested - was not a point of discussion, but a target that needed to be addressed through disapproval, judgement and the evocation of a preferable alternative.

However, the repertoire of 'responsibility' demonstrates an even deeper challenge within the supervisor/client interaction, and one that arguably goes beyond instances of its usage. The necessity of a client's own self-motivation to pursue positive change and overcome contextual challenges in their life - manifest in 'responsibility' as this imperative for self-protection against one's own normative deficits - has a troubling aspect to it. The client's responsibility for self-control was, in fact, a microcosm for the client's greater responsibility for self-change [Lynch, 2000]. Although supervision reached the same unfortunate outcome by a different means - emphasising client agency in pursuing their own change and overcoming obstacles thereto, as opposed to Lynch's findings of parole services

constructing clients as 'choosing' to remain in the correctional system and reframing issues of rehabilitation as those of bad attitude - the result was nevertheless similar. That is to say, the client bore a considerable burden of self-help. Clear [2005] presents this issue in a more sympathetic light, and one more arguably reflective of CPO supervision: the consequences of individuation, wherein the 'onus of probation's success [is placed] on people rather than collectives or social entities' [p176]. In the cases of CPO supervision observed as part of this research, the ethos of empowering clients to visualise a desired state, undertake efforts towards realising that and address challenges that obstructed their efforts, combined with the lack of resources and networked capacity to obtain wider organisational or societal support for such client efforts, ultimately created a much wider issue of 'responsibility' than the mere term alone. While the client was obviously the central driver to any effort at realising desistance, and supervisors offered what personal support they could in the face of recognised, acknowledged societal obstacles, the ultimate tragedy remains that clients were typically alone in their efforts to fight against the same contextual inequalities, deprivations and traumas that had given rise to their offending in the first place. Although supervisors assisted however they could, and worked diligently to connect clients to whatever external sources of support were available, the considerable responsibility for changing their lives fell solely and ultimately on the clients themselves.

It is important at this stage, however, to stress that supervisors exercised significant conceptual restraint in those facets of a client's life for which they emphasised the client needed to take 'responsibility'. Matters such as employability, familial struggles or substance abuse were all recognised as problems that required more than simply the client taking greater control over their lives and demonstrating positive, constructive effort. 'Responsibility' was a theme brought up in areas where clients had the potential to influence their lives either positively or negatively, and were currently influencing their lives in the latter fashion (a theme discussed in

greater detail in the subsequent part). While these areas may have some bearing on wider issues outwith clients' control - such as some clients refusing to attend Job Centre sessions for skills-building or even employment opportunities - the emphasis remained throughout on the client's as-yet-unrealised potential. This allowed clients to maintain the fundamental framework of support within which supervision operated, supplemented by the recognition that clients deserved both interpersonal encouragement and practical assistance in developing this greater responsibility, whether that be in gaining new life skills or discussing the challenges that influenced their 'irresponsibility'. At no point was the client left isolated, expected to shoulder the burden of living a 'better' life entirely upon their own personal responsibility. Rather, 'responsibility' was the indication of opportunities to address challenges in their lives, which supervisors would assist them with, but which required the client's active choice to undertake. Thus, while a moral judgement on the supervisor's part that a client wasn't behaving to an acceptable standard, even this judgement - with its attendant social expressions of disapproval and censure - was calibrated to encourage the client to recognise and harness their own agency.

In many ways, this two-track system of problem solving presents a more modernised iteration of the Risk, Need and Responsivity model [Bonta et al., 2008]. Risk, rather than operating on a meta-service level, instead translated to an individual prioritisation of issues, with supervisors deliberately choosing to respond to more immediately pressing problems (housing, finance, ongoing behaviour that carries a risk of offending) first in order to maintain at least a modicum of stability in the client's status quo. Need maintained the recognition that such factors emerged from underlying issues, and that while efforts needed to be made to maintain client lifestyle stability, that was only a short-term achievement if not used to address criminogenic factors of which risk-based problems were a symptom. Responsivity, as a result, expanded beyond a simple adaptation to clients' learning style, instead developing into the collaborative relationship seen

above, wherein the supervisor recognised the importance a client's context and own, personal agency played in addressing the prior two levels of issues. Rather than an objective, assessment-driven model of interaction, this process was far more interpersonal: as demonstrated above, the week-by-week usage of meetings to cooperatively discuss, explore and address immediate, practical problems also helped pave the way for clients to undertake their own, more developmental, steps in addressing deeper normative challenges concerning their background, social situation and behaviour-underpinning values. Rather than dividing the assessment of problems and consequent 'follow through' of addressing them through case management, with its attendant pro-social modelling of supervisors demonstrating empathy and encouragement [Bonta et al., 2008], assessment was shared, if not outright endowed as a positional privilege, to the client; rather than leveraging a positive interpersonal relationship towards determined interventions (with the partial exception of the 'responsibility' repertoire), supervisors attended clients' accounts of their risks and needs, and used that same relationship as a medium to explore, rather than impress, solutions within a more balanced partnership. While clients were sometimes referred to specialist agencies in order to address needs that supervisors were neither trained nor equipped to support, the core focus remained on addressing problems through informed and motivated response, rather than generic methods of self-management and risk-aversion [Hannah-Moffat, 2005]. A client's risks and needs were not immutable, objective facts; the emphasis of supervision was sincerely on solving problems - whether that be finding practical responses to address more immediate situations, or supporting clients in confronting and addressing underlying normative issues to the point where they might consider those issues resolved. This did, however, lead to certain complications when it came to the brokerage of external, specialist services which, given the inherent nature of their specialisation, required a more 'technist' [Kemshall, 2010] approach to clients wherein standardised, objective assessments of their problems were the key

determinant of which services to involve; while supervision itself remained a dynamic, client-centric relationship, specialist services represented a far more predetermined reality within which the client was categorised and responded to based upon a particular facet of external assessment.

This bridge between practical problems/risk factors and underlying normative/criminogenic needs also has a distinct similarity to Ugwudike's findings on client compliance [2010]. While the idea of problem solving as a means of addressing client issues that threaten to complicate supervision attendance and involvement is a subject more pertinently discussed in the subsequent section of this chapter, the idea of clients' growing awareness of issues, and confidence in dealing with said issues, reinforces this developmental idea of two-track problem solving. In addition, the critical medium of the supervisor/client interpersonal relationship is once again reinforced: a relationship that could facilitate honesty and empathy from client and supervisor, and achieved its therapeutic ends through the provisioned opportunity for the client to 'talk' through their problems with a supervisor (an emphasis echoed by Robinson [2005] concerning interpersonal engagement and problem-solving).

If there was one critical limitation to this model of collaborative problem solving, it was the practical restraints of support and assistance the supervisor is able to provide. While the provision of a safe space to engage in an open discussion and solution-development session was valuable, the onus invariably fell on the client to realise their own response, given supervisors' highly limited capacity to enact any practical assistance. As observed by King [2013], while supervisors' abilities to make phone calls, write letters and fill in forms could provide some valuable assistance in certain contexts, the more common response (both in that research and in this case study) was reference to external agencies - either in addressing ongoing practical problems such as housing, finance and lack of job skills, or to address underlying normative challenges that required specialist training (especially in areas of trauma, counselling and substance abuse). Given the

often considerable wait times for such external agencies, and the fact that many clients expressed dissatisfaction regarding their relationships with agency members, especially in comparison to their established dynamic with supervisors, it was a distinct demonstration of the supervisor/client relationship's limitations. In the absence of practical means to provide assisting intervention in clients' lives, or the specialist training to engage in a deeper confrontation of clients' issues, then the supervision relationship could only act as a glorified think-tank for clients to attempt to tackle their own problems. While this was feasible for internal, personal issues such as alcoholism, for wider issues entrenched in deprivation and inequality, such as employment, finances or housing, this was far from feasible. At best, it was able to furnish clients with specialist support (variant depending on the agency's available resources and quality of relationships with clients), or at worst was unable to provide the 'direct help' King's research [2013] found similar probation relationships to be lacking. While supervision might have been able to improve 'decision-making' through client-empowering discussion and conclusion, such developmental support ultimately still left the onus of problem resolution squarely on clients' shoulders.

The significance of these interactions, while comparable to overarching frameworks of risk discourse, was much more in line with change-based client rehabilitation. The challenge, however, was in clearly defining how the client is positioned within that rehabilitation: the emphasis on client discussion and self-solution, supplemented by specialists agencies and (in cases of reluctance) a quasi-moral evocation of 'responsibility' would indicate, on the surface, an expanded model of cognitive behaviouralism. Even if the origin of criminogenesis was not located in the client, its influence upon them gave rise to a series of deficits that, if addressed through enhanced reasoning, self-understanding and contextual agency, could be managed or even overcome [Day, 2011]. However, this supervision model did not so much place the client at fault, as somehow 'maladapted' or suffering from 'cognitive deficits', and was not concerned with addressing perceived

'cognitive distortions'. Balanced alongside the wider efforts noted in other chapters at a prototypical form of desistance - the long-term, individualised pursuit of a non-offending lifestyle through the development of personal motivation, skills and wider social opportunities [Deering, 2014] - this framework of cognitive behaviouralism actually served as a means to explore the influence and impact problems had upon clients' perspectives, and importantly emphasised the client's ability to choose their own course of action [Hannah-Moffat, 2005]. Rather than teaching self-management and self-control techniques, this focus on the client's cognitive faculties was intended to enhance their own ability to respond consciously and deliberately to these problems, in a manner that allows them to pursue their own desired outcome rather than simply react to crises. In this sense, change was about the development and deployment of client agency. The limitation of this change-based approach, as has already been and will continue to be demonstrated, is that such a preponderant focus on the individual client's ability to influence their environment overlooked the environment's influence over individuals, both in the need for positive conditions to enable and enhance agentic choice (such as social conditions, positive communities/associations, employability, and other such social capital) [McNeill, 2006], and the ongoing negative impact that societal deprivation and inequalities exerted upon clients which could not be redressed purely through unsupported acts of individual agentic will [Kemshall, 2002]. There is also, as noted by Lynch [2000], the danger that when a system places an emphasis on the client's choice to either persist or desist, any failure to 'choose' the latter carries with it the dual implication that the failure is the sole responsibility of the client (rather than supervision, or society as a wider whole), and that the client is somehow deviant (in the case of supervision, lacking in 'responsibility'). While the supervision observed in this case study did not fall into the coercive, laissez-faire scenario Lynch envisioned, it nevertheless remains important to emphasise the dangers of an agentic rehabilitative approach, especially one lacking wider societal support. As will

be seen, the failure of a client to solve their problems cannot immediately or fairly be equated with their unwillingness to do so.

Attempting to discuss instances in which this two-track process of problem solving did not succeed is difficult, purely by virtue of the multiplicity of ways it was able to falter or fail. But this multiplicity was only skin-deep, and a common theme existed beneath: a disconnect in perception between supervisor and client. Where invocations of 'responsibility' did not successfully leverage the client's perspective to address a problem, supervisors would instead attempt to expand that perspective: encouraging them to think further ahead at how some facet of their life or behaviour would, in the future, lead to negative consequences. By altering the terms of the discussion in this way, supervisors were sometimes able to harness a shared, typically fundamental, priority that would bring clients into step with supervisors' efforts to address the problem. The two most common of these priorities were the problem's likelihood of causing increased financial or social hardship, or a run-in with the police.

However, as Morgan and Riley both noted in our discussions, the difficulty in achieving such an alteration of terms was that the negative future consequences they raised with their clients were comparable to the consequences they were already facing. Many recognised that, yes, their behaviour in response to an immediate problem could cause issues later, but it would avoid issues in the more immediate future. Christopher's insistence on carrying a knife to protect himself in his neighbourhood, for instance, was made in the full knowledge that if he was caught or forced to defend himself with it, he would likely face "jail time". But, from his perspective, it was a choice between that possible, long-term consequence, or the more immediate threat that, due to the spurious rumours spread about him, he felt at risk of "getting jumped" on his way home every night. In a similar vein, Bruce once explained to Riley the reason for his move from Glasgow to Edinburgh: although already on supervision at the time, and knowing there was a risk that such a move would be constituted as a breach, he "just had to

get out" of the city as a means of putting distance between himself and his abusive foster-father.

Other instances were less dramatic, but nonetheless personally challenging (especially when linked to deeper, more normative client issues): an inability to attend job-skills training because of depression, an inability to maintain financial stability because of outstanding debts (or, of particularly cruel irony, reduced welfare due to offending behaviour), and a breakdown in living standards and social connections due to substance dependency. To say clients were 'unwilling' to solve problems would have been erroneous, and supervisors recognised that; it was a case of clients either already possessing their own, pre-existing metric of problem solving, or finding problems beyond their capacity to solve because of entrenched contextual issues.

Thus, the disconnect was not between supervisors viewing certain behaviours or facets of a client's life as problematic, and clients not reciprocating that perception. Clients recognised the problematic factors in their behaviour, or the long-term consequences of their lifestyles, and indeed also recognised (and appreciated) supervisors' efforts to "get them back on track" or "doing the right things". The disconnect, and the consequent inability of supervisors to construct some shared reality where the two worked towards solutions, was that the clients' perceptions - their priorities, concerns and criterion of necessity - emerged from a radically different context. 'Chaotic lives' is a term so frequently used to describe supervision clients that it borders on stereotypical [Deering, 2011], but it provides a useful framework from which to understand the challenges faced by clients and supervisors. In an interactive dynamic that placed such a heavy emphasis on clients' agency, granting them a space to shape a shared reality with their own concerns, and placing the supervisor in an ancillary support role to help the client formulate and enact a solution, it is perhaps no real surprise that the greatest obstacle was a corrupted reflection of that same agency. The wider lives clients faced, with all attendant deprivations and inequalities, if not outright forced clients'

choices, at the very least weighed heavily upon their perspectives in making them. Supervisors approached the interaction from a professional and personal effort to help clients improve their lives and thereby achieve desistance, but clients approached the interaction from the much greater practical need to function within their current lives, with the immediate problems they brought to meetings being the product of earlier, or underlying, problems: poverty, lack of employment, substance dependency, trauma, insufficient welfare, poor housing, antisocial communities, and so on. Client agency wasn't free, but conditioned by and conditional upon their circumstances. While supervision presented a safe space clients wherein clients could discuss the issues they faced and try to formulate a response, it could not provide a blank slate from which to get a fresh start at those issues. The most pernicious facet of the worst problems clients faced was that they protected themselves from solutions.

In this regard, the challenges faced by CPO supervision demonstrate a strong similarity to the challenges probation has historically faced when it comes to clients' social contexts. The use of so-called 'talking methods', external agency referrals and whatever direct help the supervisor was able to provide were, likewise, the only resources available in CPO supervision, and likewise could only achieve the best case scenario of achieving an 'improvement' in, rather than any 'resolution' of, clients' social problems [McCulloch, 2005, p14]. However, while McCulloch and prior research [Rex, 1998; Farrall, 2002] have strongly advocated for the same agentic approach followed in CPO supervision - emphasising 'talking methods' to clarify problems, develop solutions and build motivation to enact those solutions - the findings herein demonstrate that enhanced, empowered client agency is on its own insufficient in addressing a living environment that is, in many significant ways, hostile to positive change and a law-abiding lifestyle. Thus is it little surprise that prior research noted similarly limited success in probation overcoming such problems. McCulloch [2005] vitally emphasises the need to activate a collaborative support network within a client's

community - family, local agencies, employment etc. - in order to provide the necessary resources to enable client desistance and overcome the contextual obstacles they face (although it may be debated how optimistic such an emphasis is in its presumption that clients already possess such pro-social networks).

It is important to emphasise at this stage that, while developing a client's agency to pursue desistance without the necessary social capital to realise it is limited, that is not to say that such agentic development is wasted effort. Desistance theory would argue, and research would seem to indicate [LeBel et al., 2008], that a client's normative state is a vital driver in choosing to pursue desistance: ideas of hope, self-efficacy, positive self-conceptualisation come to define the new identity a client wants to pursue, and thus the steps they become motivated to take in its pursuit. It is as unrealistic, and potentially dangerous, to presume that contextual change will result in client change as it is to presume that client agency can tackle societal deprivation and inequalities on its own. Indeed, it may be argued, in contrast with prior research [Healy and O'Donnell, 2008], that the CPO clients herein observed were better empowered in their agentic development: while they lacked the resources to enable their agency, notions of pursuing new goals, gaining greater control over one's life, raising one's status, overcoming obstacles, and the pursuit of commitment to some responsibility greater than the self (typically family or a vocational passion) helped to foster positive motivation and self-identity.

Part 2 - The Client as a Complicating Factor

One of the largest sources of complications to not only the problem solving process, but the entirety of supervision, were clients themselves. From simple disruptions such as failing or forgetting to attend meetings at the appointed time, to more in-depth behavioural complications such as an unwillingness to participate in a mandated CPO requirement, or carry on with

a previously-agreed brokered service because of some perceived deficit, a considerable amount of time was spent by supervisors in attempting to address, or at least minimise, clients generating their own additional, complicating factors to the supervision process.

Many of the more practical complications were met, at the initial stage, with supervisors' trademark empathy and individualisation: they listened to clients' explanations about why they had failed to attend a meeting, and understood that their non-attendance wasn't malicious, but rather the consequence of wider factors in their life beyond their control. As a result of this awareness of clients' contexts, supervisors made an overt effort to be flexible, passing the choice of when to schedule their next meeting to the client so that the priority was clearly focussed on when they were most likely to be free; if the supervisor was not free at that date and time, they would endeavour to suggest a slot as close to the one suggested by the client as possible, or return the choice to them for an alternative. But this endowment of scheduling did come with the expectation that, if clients arranged their own meeting time, they would honour that arrangement. In situations where effort had been made to accommodate a client, and the client had still failed to attend, supervisors responded by reminding clients that non-attendance would eventually lead to breach proceedings. While supervisors demonstrated some surface-level frustration, annoyance or otherwise negative response, this was not belaboured so as to avoid tarnishing any progress at rapport with the client; rather, the externalised, objectified, abstracted force of 'breach proceedings' as a disembodied, automatic phenomenon could bear the burden of tacitly warning the client that, while reasonable efforts were being made to accommodate their attendance, they were equally under expectations (and obligations) to attend.

The interesting irony is that, while breach proceedings often served as a 'bad cop' supervisors could invoke in a Damoclean fashion to preserve their own 'good cop' stance (empathic with clients and oriented towards encouraging and supporting them, rather than indicating any palpable

element of monitoring and punishing), the majority of supervision efforts in dealing with clients' own complications was to avoid such breach proceedings. In discussions, supervisors explained that the principal criterion for what constituted a client-based complication was that it would cause disruption to their supervision progress, and nothing caused a greater disruption than breach proceedings: in the best case, it involved their entire Order being suspended temporarily pending a return to court, and at worst could result in an upscaling of the sentence to imprisonment (a situation that, thankfully, never occurred during my observational period, but weighed heavily as a threat to both supervisors and clients alike).

This notion of client-based complication as a key theme within supervision interactions touches upon one of the key tensions within any probationary relationship: that between the ultimate goal of rehabilitation and the necessity of enforcing the sentence, for without enforcement rehabilitation becomes impunity, but an overabundance of enforcement limits rehabilitative efforts [Canton, 2007]. As has been noted in prior chapters, while public protection was a central goal of CPO supervision, it was achieved in practice as a consequence of convenience, with the primary effort of supervisors instead remaining focussed on engagement with clients in a mutual effort at long-term change. The same holds true here: while client complications could have been interpreted as risk factors that endangered either their formal compliance with their Order's requirements, or even held the potential for reoffending, supervisors' approaches in the first instance were to address them as personal obstacles to clients' own aspirations and constructive efforts. The consequence, at least in positive instances of such problem solving, was that while 'enforcement' was achieved - clients remained within the parameters of their Order, and their likelihood of reoffending was lessened (or at least maintained at status quo) - it was achieved through the more effective means of a client-centred, internally chosen constraint, rather than an externally-imposed mechanism of restraint [Canton, 2012]. While the supervisor did maintain a monitoring function,

ensuring the client did not pose a risk of breach or reoffending, that function was not antagonistic, but rather incorporated into the ongoing effort at engagement and rapport [Grounds, 1995]. Clients were not immutably dangerous or risky individuals to be controlled or punished; rather their risk was born of underlying needs that should be addressed in a supportive, interactive manner and should never serve as the defining aspect of interactions with them [Raynor, 2001]. The very facets of offenders' lives that another framework would have interpreted as risk factors to be managed were, instead, the goals that clients wanted to see changed [Fenton, 2013]. Far from breaking down the client/supervisor relationship into an impersonal process of assessment and management, this signification further emphasises the importance of interpersonal commitment and meaningful engagement between both stakeholders in addressing the same problems but in a different light [Robinson, 2005]. In this sense, while there was a degree of risk discourse within the supervisor/client relationship, the risk was understood to the client's own efforts to maintain and achieve in the long-term a law-abiding lifestyle (and did not, in contrast to research by Fitzgibbon [2007], come at the expense of supervisors' abilities to engage and empower their clients).

Carrying on the link between client complications and their assessed risk factors, this emphasis on continued, constructive and client-centric engagement with clients' endeavoured to side-step many of the interactive pitfalls that such a dimension could bring to the relationship. For instance, in discussing the incorporation of public protection into supervisor/client relationships, Fitzgibbon and Lea [2010] note their concern for the likelihood of the supervisor becoming condemnatory, setting aside normative engagement for normative judgement of the client as being to blame for their own actions, disengaged from the task of supporting their change in favour of fixing assessed problems through control mechanisms. More than even Canton's notion of 'obliquity' [2012], the supervision relationship avoided this pitfall of risk/public protection discourse by positioning the main antagonistic

threat of the client's situation not as the client themselves, but the Order. Amidst the interactive context of CPO supervision as a means of protecting the public by helping to support client-driven change, the client was not understood as a danger (even one who merited the comparatively gentle control mechanism of internalised change); rather, the client was an ordinary citizen, made distinct from others only by virtues of the challenges (i.e. risk factors by another name) they faced. They were not a threat to the public, rather the true threat was that of breach proceedings, and the mutual threat of imprisonment it carried as a potential consequence - for clients, prison represented a destruction of their ordinary lives both for the duration of the sentence and in its consequent after-effects [Weaver and Armstrong, 2011], while for supervisors such an outcome was perceived as the ultimate fail-state for their efforts at supportive change. With such a mutuality at the core of their dynamic, supervision interactions were able to maintain both an indirect enforcement effort and a cooperative, constructive interpersonal relationship that did not succumb to surveillance or antagonism.

Once Keith was settled into his supervision meeting, Morgan raised the issue of a concerning notification they'd received from their colleagues: Keith had stopped attending his unpaid work requirement. When asked whether something was wrong, Keith explained that he got anxious around groups of new people, and that his anxiety in unpaid work was making him angry with his fellow clients. Morgan attempted to explore Keith's anxiety, asking how he usually overcame it - "You met me, after all, and I'm a new person" - but Luke deflected the question, responding simply that Morgan was "different". Having tried to reach out and understand Luke's perspective, Morgan then shared their own: they were concerned that if Luke continued his non-attendance he'd be breached, "and all the good work we've been doing will stop". Luke nodded, seeming to appreciate this point, and grew more energised as he explained that he'd been thinking about

that, and after talking with other clients, realised he could be excused from unpaid work on medical grounds. The expectation in his tone suggested he was looking to Morgan to help him in this scheme, but Morgan explained that they had no influence over the terms of his unpaid work, and made one last personal request for Luke to "try and stick at it". Luke replied that he "just can't go on with it", and so Morgan briefly explained that if he was determined not to return, and didn't want to be breached, he would have to arrange a doctor's appointment to provide evidence as to a medical grounds that would allow the court to modify his Order. This part of the meeting's discussion ended with Morgan reassuring Luke that if he "has any problems [with the doctor], let me know".

Morgan's priority in this interaction - both at the outset and when Luke revealed the full extent of his complication - was to avoid any threat to Luke's ongoing involvement in supervision. Their first interactive step was an attempt to learn Luke's own perspective on the situation; Luke may have been complicating matters by his own actions, but those actions had a reason behind them, and that reason had a better chance at providing a solution than any immediately punitive or control-based response. Luke's response did indeed offer such an insight into his own perspective on the matter, and informed Morgan's own consequent response: an attempt to address the anxiety Luke had raised as the key complicating factor. As with previous instances of problem solving, the supervisory effort was geared towards creating some shared relevancy within the interaction - a common ground where both perspectives could meet, and from which a mutual response could be developed. For Luke, that common ground was the very interpersonal relationship Morgan used to leverage his involvement in the first place, but Luke refused to acknowledge that as a relevant factor and so intersubjectivity was impossible.

Luke was locked into his perception that unpaid work wasn't

something he wanted to be involved in, and his resultant course of action was to cease attendance. Having attempted a deeper, normative engagement targeted at the cause of the complication to resolve it, Morgan's only available alternative was a secondary, practical response to mitigate the damage Luke's insistence would cause. Thus it seemed evident that the key priority in supervision, especially with regard to clients' own complications, was the maintenance of client involvement in the process; while the threat of breach proceedings as part of the wider interactive context was a viable tool to encourage a shift in client perspective (arguably the lowest common denominator of shared relevancy and compliance-driven motivation), its actual use was considered undesirable even by supervisors due to its disruptive effects on supervisor/client interactions. More than simply the ability to set the agenda of the interaction, and take the initiative in determining the issues to which Morgan must respond, what Luke really demonstrated with regard to the client's position within the interaction is far more fundamental: that, based on a supervisor's change-driven, supporting perspective, a client with the potential for further, constructive progress was to be protected. Thus, while Luke's withdrawal from unpaid work was undesirable, if he was unwilling to engage in a discussion to address the root causes of that complication, it fell to Morgan to choose the lesser of two evils and limit the negative consequences of that complication.

But moreso even than the supervisor protecting the client, situations where mitigation must seek a lesser evil demonstrated a respect for the client as an agentic individual. In a similar situation where Riley received a call, completely out of the blue, from one of their clients explaining that he was moving to another city so he could be with his new partner, Riley similarly attempted at the first instance to discuss this complication with the client (namely, whether this was a spur-of-the-moment romantic declaration, or a thought-out decision both of them had discussed). When the client proved determined to make the move, rather than threaten breach proceedings or attempt to exercise some model of self-control upon the client, Riley instead

got to work on the contingencies of damage-limitation: transferring the client's necessary details to the new city's social work team so as to prevent him from constituting a default breach by his non-attendance in Edinburgh. The client had made a choice, and no matter how ill-informed, complicating or potentially hazardous to her compliance with her Order, Riley did not perceive it as their responsibility or role to change her mind, but simply to facilitate and support him in whatever way would achieve the most positive (or least negative) outcome - in this instance, it was minimising the harmful impact of his decision.

It was mid-November, and Riley was meeting with Rebecca to discuss her involvement and progress with a brokered, external agency. Rebecca's account of her work with the agency was positive, but she seemed subdued, and eventually explained to Riley that the approaching holidays had her worried. As a recovering alcoholic, Rebecca had a history of struggling over the Christmas and New Year period, typically relapsing on at least on occasion every year - something she did not want to repeat this year, given the fact that she "almost [had her] life in order". Riley nodded, and asked Rebecca to describe the circumstances which typically provoke a relapse; they were closely linked to the isolation she experienced during a period where society told her she should be with 'loved ones', causing a mixture of anxiety and depression that led to drinking. The two discussed how Rebecca might guard against those feelings this year, and eventually with Riley's help Rebecca formulated a plan she felt comfortable with: she would carry out volunteer work at her local shelter during the holidays, allowing both for a degree of social contact with others, as well as a self-affirming action for herself in doing something positive at Christmas.

When I met Rebecca in mid-January for our last discussion about her

supervision meetings, she was feeling optimistic. January was still a difficult month for her, she explained, but she had managed to make it over the Christmas/New Year hurdle for the first time in several years without a relapse. She considered it a personal victory, and I considered it a testament to the success that a supervisor and client could accomplish when the client themselves recognised the challenges in their own lives. Not, obviously, challenges to their compliance/attendance with supervision, but wider difficulties they faced that would have a negative impact on the positive progress they believed supervision was supporting them in achieving. Rebecca's alcoholism was, formally, a risk factor that could impact her compliance, but the approach from both her and Riley was much more personal: the risk was to herself, and the trajectory supervision was supporting her in realising. Rather than the supervisor needing to discover some shared point of relevancy to convince a client of some complication, Rebecca had raised the subject of her alcoholism already recognising the threat it posed to her progress. Both parties were on the same page in wanting to address it, and the response they developed was grounded in and informed by the particulars of the challenge Rebecca faced, especially the underlying normative workings of her thoughts and feelings (as opposed to purely practical self-management). Rebecca's openness, willingness to collaborate on a response and determination in enacting that response successfully realised the client-centric efforts of supervision not to control clients, or instil self-discipline techniques, but to provide external support to them in realising their own tenable solutions to challenges that would persist beyond supervision's finite duration.

Other success stories of supervision helping clients overcome or avoid their own complications were less dramatic, but no less indicative of this collaborative support effort. When Keith was facing a court appearance for an outstanding offence committed before his current Order, he and Morgan set aside the final ten minutes of a meeting to confirm he knew where he had to be, at what time, how best to conduct himself in court and what the potential

verdicts would mean for him. While this interaction was considerably more didactic than that between Riley and Rebecca, with Morgan acting more as an educator imparting necessary information and confirming Keith's retention thereof, it was nevertheless in service of a shared effort to improve Keith's odds for a preferable outcome, and borne of a mutual desire for Keith to continue working with Morgan.

Problem Solving - The Problem of Context

If the preceding chapter emphasised the importance of client agency, this chapter demonstrates the difficult limitations on self-determination that restrain the intersubjective reality supervisors and clients endeavour to collaboratively construct. What may have appeared on the surface to be little more than difficult or obstinate clients were actually, when subjected to greater scrutiny, the product of deep-seated societal challenges exerting a negative influence over supervision; challenges against which supervision was simply not equipped to respond. Even supervision's own CPO context, and the spectre of incarceration that came with breach proceedings, was an ultimately harmful outcome that both parties believed was better avoided: regardless of the circumstances, problems or behaviours in question, a continued effort at supervision and its provision of support was preferable to the annihilation of the supervisor/client reality.

That is not to say that problem solving was a wholly pessimistic theme in the effort to understand the realities constructed by supervisor and client in their interactions. It did continue the individualising effort to develop and harness a client's own understanding of their own problems, developing through discussion not only a client's own solution to the immediate problem, but also their own understanding and practical grasp of the more pernicious and abstract needs they faced: Martin and Rebecca's triggers for their alcoholism were readily the two greatest success stories in this regards (arguably because their problems were most compatible with the

individualised, resource-limited nature of CPO supervision). This two-track process placed the interaction of supervisor and client as the key driver of problem solving, allowing the client to express themselves whilst placing the supervisor in a supportive, facilitative role that typically emphasised guided self-reflection on the client's part, aiding them in developing better self-understanding and self-determination in responding to problems both immediate and underlying. With regards to the initial, internal stages of a client's transformation of their own self-identity as a step towards desistance [Paternoster and Bushway, 2009], this was undoubtedly a strength of the supervisor/client interactions.

While supervisors themselves often perceived their core interpersonal relationship with clients as lacking the necessary specialist skills required to deal with the psychological, developmental or social challenges, they were raised and responded to in a mutual fashion that emphasised client experience and lifestyle impact, rather than actuarial assessment and treatment intervention. Clients were once again offered space and time to be active contributors to and influencers of the support they receive - subjects, rather than objects - and while the specialist nature of brokered services may have constricted their self-expression to an understandable degree, supervisors' characterisation of supervision as the nexus point for the entirety of a client's Order ensured they would always have a place to express their concerns, difficulties or grievances.

This conceptualisation of supervision as the keystone of the CPO has several positive consequences. Issues of client non-compliance, or similar situations that might otherwise have been responded to with a mechanical enforcement response, were instead met with a similar dialogue, and its attendant emphasis on the client's perspective. The reason for a client's behaviour was the greater focus compared to the behaviour itself, and so the supportive, client-centred narrative of supervisor/client interactions was maintained even when the client's own behaviour might be regarded as threatening or undermining that relationship, or their Order more generally.

Supervisors' efforts at helping clients were not a veneer over internal mechanisms of enforcement and monitoring, but rather those necessities were incorporated into that change-supporting narrative.

Issues did, however, arise when that narrative was put under client strain and supervisors deployed their 'responsibility' repertoire. It is little surprise that, in the absence of client cooperation in producing a more collaborative, constructive shared reality, there would exist some minimum mutual standard that supervisors would endeavour to unilaterally impose, and the effort remained one that tries to emphasise support over punishment despite its judgemental leverage. Nevertheless, it is telling that when the more positive facets of the supervisory relationship, and the intersubjectivity it endeavours to create, were strained, an impression of internalised self-control and risk-management mechanisms was the fallback position. Arguably, this raises the dangers of agency's darker side: that of responsibilisation, where clients are held to account for supposedly deficient or dangerous behaviour [McNeill, 2004]. While supervisors exercised considerable restraint in deploying this particular repertoire, it nevertheless demonstrates the risk that a more enforcement, penal-oriented discourse might intrude upon their interactions with clients should the more ideal aspirations of agency sour [Day, 2011; Deering, 2014].

This, in turn, brings us to the greatest problem to which the theme of problem solving in supervision had no solution: the challenge of context (especially a client's daily environment [McNeill, 2006]). Supervision was a safe space; this fact was recognised by both supervisors and clients, and its advantages have been noted as providing clients a confidential, supportive relationship in which to raise problems that expectations or (self-)perceptions would render them unable to do so in their wider lives. But supervision, and the interactions and realities constructed therein, was only an hour per week at most for each client, and the rest of the time they had to live in tension with social inequalities, deprivation, risk factors, anti-social influences and other contingencies of their societal existence. Even with sincere motivation, the

path towards desistance is a difficult one; but when pro-social assets are not only limited, but the client is actively under siege by anti-social assets, it becomes nigh impossible. Rarely was it the case that clients raised complications or refused to solve problems because of wilfulness or recalcitrance; their inability to collaborate with their supervisor was because of the gulf between their respective contexts. Supervisors were not unaware of the challenges clients faced, but even their efforts at finding some common ground to construct shared efforts at building resilience or human capital to make some headway against the societal inertia clients faced was a struggle. Risky behaviour, even sometimes outright offending behaviour, was a product of clients' altered perspectives in response to the challenges in their lives - the lesser, or at least the latter, of two evils.

Ultimately, such a situation demonstrated not only the futility, but the problematic nature, of change-driven system that strived to emphasise and empower a client's own agency. Self-determination was not an absolute freedom, but contingent upon one's situation and its conditions; without commensurate intervention for their situations, support and help for clients could only go so far [McCulloch, 2005]. Without social capital opportunities to complete the desistance trifecta [Giordano et al., 2002], motivation and human capital skills only burdened the client to address problems in their lives beyond the scope of individuals, especially ones whose problems were a product of inequalities, to address. However, without resources to provide such social capital opportunities, that was all the support supervision was able to provide, lacking the necessary tools to solve the one universal problem it really needed to. While supervisors did not hold clients responsible for their inability to achieve long-term change, the framework and (limited) resources of the CPO made them solely responsible for the effort [King, 2012].

Chapter 8 - The Act of Working

It was obvious from the outset of my observational case study into the CPO's unpaid work requirement that the interactions between its stakeholders were of a profoundly different nature to those within the supervision requirement. Unpaid work did not involve extended discussion between clients and professional social workers as to the nature of their offending behaviour or the wider criminogenic factors that challenged their personal change. Interactions between clients and their corresponding stakeholder in unpaid work - which itself proved to be an unexpected complication - were altogether smaller and/or subtler: either ingrained within the ongoing focus of the requirement upon practical, physical tasks, or through those very tasks themselves as both symbolic and experiential media.

Although this was anticipated in the literature examined to give this project's findings on CPO unpaid work wider contextual value, it nevertheless remained an ongoing challenge to examine this far less literal interactive field in a way that balanced insight with evidenced reasoning. Indeed, in this way, the work undertaken by clients on behalf of its beneficiaries serves as an invaluable starting point for understanding the realities constructed between the two stakeholders, serving as it does not only the focal topic and physical space for such interactions, but the dialogic means by which stakeholder perceptions were engaged, altered and harnessed towards greater purposes.

Part 1 - Framing the Work

The Wednesday group to which I was assigned was responsible for Montrose Park: a small patch of parkland inside Edinburgh proper, made popular with locals and school groups for its various amenities. On my first visit to Montrose Park, it became gradually apparent that a great many preconceptions I had held regarding unpaid work - or, at

least, one foundational assumption that informed others - had been profoundly incorrect. Upon reaching the park and vacating our van, we were each given a high-visibility jacket; unlike the van, which was branded only with 'City of Edinburgh Council', these jackets were completely unmarked. In the absence of any explicit indicator that the clients, their supervisor or I were on an unpaid work order, we collectively became an anonymous group: members of the public visiting the park overlooked us in the manner anyone might overlook council workers going about their duty. The implications for the concept of 'community' were great, and would become a recurring theme in my field notes, but its ramifications with regards to the unpaid work itself were more immediate and practical. From the outset, it was clear that the interactions taking place were not between clients and members of the public in the role as beneficiaries - there was no direct, verbal interaction, and the work carried no symbolic value to a public ignorant of its performance as anything other than ordinary council work. Rather, the interactions were between clients and those organisers and managers of the sites wherein the work took place; the direct beneficiaries who, by virtue of arranging the unpaid work on both a council and day-to-day level, were aware of the clients' 'true' nature and interacted with them as such. This was the dynamic that would come to define what the unpaid work order meant in practice, whilst scores of ordinary visitors looked on unaware.

It is crucial to identify, from the outset of this discussion of unpaid work projects, who this case study identifies and treats as the beneficiaries of said work (and, by extension, who is involved in its defining interactions with the clients). The public are not defined as beneficiaries - clients were as good as invisible to members of the public whilst out on unpaid work sites, with their fluorescent orange 'high-vis' jackets serving, ironically, not as a highlight to the penal nature of their work, but a form of social camouflage. Members of

the public passed by clients in the midst of work without acknowledgement, let alone judgement or opprobrium, and when interactions did take place between the two it was due to members of the public approaching clients under the assumption that they were employees of the park. Such interactions were thus limited to basic question/answer dynamics - where the park restrooms were located, or whether the client had seen a child's lost raincoat - and after the client had provided some response the interaction was terminated with a polite "thanks".

Rather, the 'beneficiaries' for the purpose of this case study's examination of client/beneficiary interactions, and how they determine the intersubjective reality that defines unpaid work in practice, are the actual employees and staff of the work sites in question. From the parks' managers down to its actual workers (gardeners, maintenance staff, etc.), these were the individuals aware of the nature of clients' presence at the site, and with whom clients interacted in the context of their unpaid work. It was these beneficiaries who set out the various tasks, conditions and contexts of the work projects that clients would execute; or, as my field notes came to define it, these initial beneficiary/client interactions framed the work.

It is, at this early point, also important to mention the role of those employees of the social work services responsible for managing the groups of unpaid work clients. As they acted primarily as intermediaries between clients and work site staff (especially management) in the assigning, oversight and feedback of tasks and projects, and their interactions with clients most typically reinforced staff beneficiaries' perspectives and meanings, they have been incorporated into the category of 'beneficiary' for the purposes of this discussion. The intent is not to erase or undervalue their contributions to unpaid work interactions, but rather to emphasise their role in facilitating and furthering beneficiaries' stances and perspectives in relation to clients.

This nature of the beneficiary has inescapable implications for the consequent nature of the social reality co-produced by the two. Brownlee

[1998], for example, draws the distinction between a sanction that is 'in the community' (a broad synonym for 'outside prison'), and a sanction that is 'of the community'. As opposed to being a matter of locale, this latter conceptualisation would involve local members of the public actually beholden to responsibilities within the sanction's framework, acting as a "group of 'significant' others" to create a network of support for the offender. What is essential to emphasise is that, just because the observed CPO work did not interact with members of the public, that does not mean it did not possess the necessary criteria to be 'of the community' - or, at least, 'of a community'. Although the parallel is not (yet) as neat between Brownlee's envisaged 'community' of significant others and this case study's beneficiaries, there is certainly a significance to those with whom clients have contact. Brownlee notes that such a group plays an important part in offender self-construction, and the seeds of a similarly collaborative process can be seen in this case study: the interaction with an integrated workforce allows, and even subtly encourages, a corresponding set of positive, work-based values that would not be activated in a more blunt, indifferent or impersonal system (i.e. one lacking a beneficiary-created framework). While at the moment there is no indication of a reparative rationale, there is a nascent sense of an, admittedly, incomplete integrative connection between the stakeholders, wherein the framing of beneficiaries and clients' relation to them establishes the first indications of unpaid work as a symbolic, self-performative medium for clients' own development (reinforced by the beneficiaries as an audience). This is paralleled by Worrall and Hoy [2005], who highlight two key criteria for the concept of community: homogeneity based on common social characteristics, and a corresponding sense of mutual responsibility. In this regard, the incorporation, and indeed normalisation, of clients into beneficiaries' workforces as pseudo-employees is a fundamental aspect of the beneficiary framework's tentatively integrative rationale; the challenge emerges in the mutuality of responsibility, given the infrequency with which client activity is reciprocated by beneficiary support.

While 'community', in terms of a positive beneficiary collective to which the client has a developing membership, may serve as an initial catalyst for engaging with unpaid work - through perceptions of positive contribution, respectful engagement, etc. - the corresponding responsibility by the 'community' to the beneficiary in terms of consequent social capital is unfulfilled. In more realistic terms, such a 'community' likely exists as a bulwark against client perceptions of isolation and alienation that in turn may fuel a sense of stigmatisation and punitiveness that tarnishes unpaid work's inherent significance [Pamment and Ellis, 2010]. The client is incorporated into an inclusive stance not as a part of an effort at long-term desistance, but rather a practical antithesis to perceived exclusion.

The second site at which I spent a considerable portion of my observational period was Argyll Park - located on the periphery of Edinburgh, it preserved a section of forest to allow its visitors a sense of 'outdoor wilderness', whilst also providing a range of themed activities. When I joined the group assigned to Argyll Park on Tuesdays, the clients had just begun construction work on an archery range. In the morning, clients met with Robert, manager of the park, to discuss the day's work. The meeting was semi-formal, with both Robert and the clients familiar enough to make jokes without losing focus on the work ahead, and Robert framed the task more as a thing that needed doing, rather than something the clients had to do. He explained that the archery range required a coating of wood chips, both to conceal the weatherproofing beneath and to fulfil various health and safety requirements. With the task thus framed, he asked the clients if they'd be willing to "help out" by transporting wheelbarrows of chippings from the park's store to the range and give it a proper coating. Finally, Robert went with the clients to check the park's store had sufficient chippings for the job, thanked the clients for their help, then left them to fulfil the task.

The overall approach beneficiaries took with clients was polite, friendly and respectful. Clients were treated somewhere between volunteers and a hired service - they were given tasks that beneficiaries expected to be completed to an acceptable standard, but in giving such tasks they framed the assignment with courtesy and gratitude for clients' forthcoming efforts. No orders were ever made; tasks were asked of clients, and while clients never refused, it was nevertheless important in beneficiaries presenting the tasks not as onerous obligations, but rather the clients contributing to an overall improvement in the park's status quo. Clients did not 'have to' do the work in this presentation; rather, the work was presented as being 'useful' or 'helpful', and it would be of benefit if the clients could perform the task asked of them.

Although clients were clearly distinct from the parks' staffs, at least from an organisationally internal perspective, this framing served to normalise their presence, incorporating them into a shared, contributive effort to maintain the parks. Thus, while clients were aware they existed within an implicit matrix of expectations - that they work hard and meet beneficiaries' standards - these expectations were framed as those of any professional performing a job (indistinguishable from those paid by the park to work there), rather than punitive conditions uniquely imposed upon clients. Clients responded positively, or at least constructively, to these expectations; rarely were the beneficiaries perceived as expecting too much, or assigning a task beyond what was possible or reasonable for clients to achieve. They perceived their work within this framework as disciplined, rather than disciplining; not some external mandate backed up by the threat of punishment, but the explication of a task that required a minimum degree of investment and involvement in order to be completed. This, in turn, would prove to be a valuable catalyst for further and deeper involvement of clients in the subtle mechanics and interactions of unpaid work: normative engagement and motivation, the nurturing and harnessing of morale, and the ultimate satisfaction and feedback of the work once completed to a given

standard. By balancing a positive stance towards clients with an underlying theme of professionalism, beneficiaries were able to create a framework whereby clients could look beyond the unspoken obligation of their CPO.

This highlights one of the key interactive moments for unpaid work, and the primary function of beneficiaries: the start-of-day tasks assignment. While beneficiaries were present and active within their given park throughout the day, and would informally chat with clients whenever they crossed paths in the same polite, pleasant, pseudo-professional manner, the key interactive moment was at the beginning of clients' six-hour shift. From a practical standpoint, beneficiaries were able to set out the practical parameters, requirements and expectations of the task(s) assigned for that day. But this explicit, practical framing also sought to establish an underlying normative framework for clients. Parameters, requirements and expectations communicated a sense of standards, and within the wider interactive framework of clients as contributors to the maintenance or improvement of the park, those had the potential to take on a deeper, more personal relevance to clients than mere requirement. In working to those standards clients had the potential to engage with the work on a personal level and generate their own set of meanings: determination, dedication, resilience, pride and self-valuation, a sense of positive contribution and constructive efforts. For instance, something as simple as Robert explaining the desired depth and even distribution of wood chippings on the archery range created a powerful response in those clients; the beneficiary's expectations gave them a set of standards to work with, and when they began coating the range they would discuss with one another whether there was sufficient coating in a particular area, or whether the distribution of chippings was sufficiently even. There was a goal to work towards - the completion of a task to a standard that would benefit the park - and its existence encouraged clients to commit to the task. Even pushing a wheelbarrow uphill to convey more chippings to the range for distribution became an act of determination and resilience in the face of increasing physical demand, because it was in service to the goal

with which beneficiaries had framed the task.

This dynamic continued throughout the day, with beneficiaries frequently checking in on clients during their assigned tasks to examine their progress made. Although an unspoken element of such check-ups was to ensure said progress was actually being made, and to an acceptable quality, it was framed within a wider interactive sequence of beneficiaries ensuring that clients hadn't encountered any unexpected obstacles, or that they had the correct tools for the job. Beneficiaries never positioned themselves as presuming clients were reluctant or lazy; while their central concern remained that clients accomplish their assigned tasks, it was presented as an invested, supportive stance - that clients be facilitated and supported as far as beneficiaries were capable of doing so in accomplishing said tasks. The end result was a subtly collaborative interplay, further downplaying the obligatory and penal elements of the work, whilst also addressing any major roadblocks clients may encounter that frustrate their deeper engagement.

Throughout these interactions, there was a notable absence of 'payback' as an influencing rationale factor for beneficiaries' framework, and indeed clients' own perceptions of the work being assigned. This is a curious absence, as even Raynor [2001], who advocates the need for community penalties to construct networks of support, nevertheless recognises the utility of reparative discourse: the recognition that unpaid work is carried out to repair some wrongdoing the client has committed, which makes a positive contribution to the beneficiaries. While the beneficiary frameworks in this case study emphasised clients' positive contribution, they neglected to address the 'why' of clients' unpaid work; no mention was made of clients' wrongdoing, or any indication that the unpaid work possessed a moral rationale of reparation, payback or atonement. While it will become increasingly apparent throughout the chapters on this case study that clients developed along positive normative trajectories through their work, this was in isolation from any discussion or conceptualisation of their offending behaviour that resulted in said work (or the contextual challenges that gave

rise to the offending behaviour). However, much of that development was tied to the consequent utility, benefit and contribution of the work, rather than any inherent moral quality therein. Thus, while it can be said that beneficiary framing did initiate the momentum towards a integrative connection between the two stakeholders, the lack of recognition regarding clients' offending prevented the more basic reparative rationale, thus failing to communicate any symbolic performative process between clients' positive contributions and an undoing of their wrongful behaviour. This, in turn, may have complicated or frustrated any meaningful effort at integration; the absence of a recognition concerning the unequal (and criminogenic) situations that gave rise to said behaviour arguably hindered the positive impact of unpaid work by means of forging long-term support connections. How can both stakeholders move forward to address clients' offending through symbolic redemption and socially supportive reintegration [Maxwell and Morris, 2001], if offending remains the unaddressed elephant in the room? Perceiving clients as wrongdoers is undoubtedly fraught with risks, necessitating a socially broad and societally cognisant perspective, but ignoring clients' offending also ignores its causes and potential remedies.

As part of its 'wilderness' facilities, Argyll Park kept a small stable of horses for riding classes. Whilst carrying out some weeding along the fence of their enclosure, Robert, a new addition to the team, began pointing out some features of the stable and discussing their role in animal husbandry. Quiet and withdrawn to that point, Robert revealed an interest in veterinary medicine, and his aspirations to one day become a veterinarian. When one of the beneficiaries checked in with the group to ensure they've not hit any roadblocks, she and Robert got into an in-depth conversation about caring for the horses. Gradually the conversation moved on to Robert's aspirations, and his struggle in putting together an application for an introductory college course because he lacked the necessary 'animal handling hours' required of

an applicant. The beneficiary suggested that Robert could come to the park at the weekends and help the staff with their horses on a voluntary basis, which Robert eagerly agreed to. While the rest of the group cleared up and stored materials at the end of the shift, Robert visited the park's main office to make the necessary arrangements.

In rare instances, such framing encounters went beyond initial assignments or facilitative check-ins, resulting in moments of interaction that paired client aspirations with work opportunities that beneficiaries could make available to them. Although not a formal aspect of unpaid work, such tasks served as the moments of contact wherein beneficiaries were able to express their own personal interest in some facet of the work, or the park's wider operation. Such expressions were admittedly few and far between, requiring not only a client to display such an interest, but a beneficiary to be in a position to respond with an offer of some extra-CPO voluntary work. In such instances, however, when interests and opportunities aligned, the unpaid work tasks served as a point of encounter between the two stakeholders that brought together mutually compatible interests - at the end of one client's unpaid work requirement, for instance, she chose to continue volunteering at Montrose Park because its staff were willing to provide her a reference for her hard work. From beneficiaries' perspective, there was the obvious interest of further voluntary labour, but these encounters also pointed to a deeper, more supportive dynamic between the two stakeholders: beneficiaries at both parks discussed with me how they were committed towards providing constructive support to those with challenging social needs. Hosting unpaid work as project sites was not a cynical means of securing free workers, but part of that commitment to facilitate reintegration. From the perspective of those few clients who were able to move beyond the solely unpaid work framing, such opportunities were embraced as valuable steps forward towards positive, aspirational visions of their future lives (invariably related to building the necessary professional profile to secure a

particular stable, personally satisfying job). Such motivation, however, also served to enhance their engagement with unpaid work in addition to this external opportunity, fostering not only a sense of gratitude to the work site that was reciprocated through dedicated work, but a personal sense (and stake) in the value of the site as a positive institution.

The problem with such encounters was, as already noted, their considerable infrequency - over the course of a four month observational period, only four such extra-CPO opportunities were noted. The reason for this is certainly attributable to the rarity in aligning client interests with beneficiary resources, but that is not to say that either side could not have been collectively flexible in such provisions. Rather, an alternative factor leading to such a limitation is the very framework beneficiaries constructed for clients and the consequent nature of their interactions. Like ordinary employees, clients were assigned tasks at the beginning of the day and then left to perform them, with occasional check-ins to determine progress and ensure no further support was required. While such interactions, and the respectful, professional treatment which clients received from beneficiaries as a result, did serve a positive function, it was founded on a conceptual fiction. Clients were not ordinary workers, and while treating them as such allowed their presence to be normalised as a valuable contribution, it occluded key issues that interactions could have addressed. Extra-CPO opportunities occurred when beneficiaries recognised clients as possessing aspirations or social needs which they were in a position to support. Clients weren't viewed as objects to be worked on, or cases in need of hand-outs, but autonomous subjects whose work could be of mutual benefit. Such mutuality could only come about by perceiving clients not as pseudo-employees whose work was of benefit only to the park, but as individuals whose work could be tied into their own lives.

Even clients recognised this factor. Although many commented that they appreciated being treated like a 'normal person', several commented to me a perception along the lines of, as one client put it: "they treat us the

same [as staff], but we're not. We've got problems they don't". Addressing such problems, and/or aspirations, would require specialist skills that may blur unpaid work with supervision, and corresponding specialist treatment may disrupt the normalisation of clients within unpaid work sites. However, it would give rise to a framework that balanced respectful treatment of clients with a recognition of their unique situation, leading to interactions where supportive opportunities were not pot-luck, but rather an integrated consequence of unpaid work as a site of contact between the two stakeholders. Although it was not perceived by any of the clients within this case study, the concern may fairly be raised that without clients reaping such dividends, unpaid work could be interpreted as subtly exploitative: fostering client engagement towards work projects with limited reciprocation.

Nevertheless, it is important to acknowledge the positive attributes that the beneficiary framing fosters within the stakeholders' interaction at the outset: an emphasis on the client as a positive contributor, and their treatment as an ordinary citizen/worker; seeking to foster a sense of quasi-professional responsibility and commitment; personal engagement in a constructive exercise. Although once again lacking the key facets of 'giving back' and providing clients with consistent opportunities to pursue positive lifestyles, these attributes nevertheless point towards a nascent form of desistance development for clients, centred around the complex internal mechanisms of building personal motivation and an improved self-perception, as well as external mechanics of the beneficiary as a subtly supportive figure [McNeill, 2004]. Those inherent significances fostered by beneficiary framing - senses of determination, pride and contribution - would come to serve as the foundation of client development across the course of unpaid work. This, in turn, served to build the initial momentum required for clients to start demonstrating (and wanting to demonstrate) the competency, reliability and trustworthiness that Bazemore and Boba [2007] highlight as critical to fostering supportive social capital with beneficiaries; indeed, the more pragmatic facets of such support - particularly those related to work

experience and the development of demonstrable work skills - were regarded by many clients in the case study as the valuable dividend they received for their work. Although far from the supportive networks and community mobilisation envisaged by Bazemore and Boba, or the community contextual challenges emphasised by McNeill, this would suggest that client engagement is not entirely synonymous with client exploitation - even if it isn't a fully fledged integrative relationship with beneficiaries, clients still derive some benefit which they view as a key contributor to their move towards a desistant lifestyle.

It is only when compared to a full (and admittedly idealised) integrative rationale, founded upon client engagement with the public, that the deficits of this diminished approach become clear. Taking as an example Robinson and Shapland's conceptualisation for a desistance-oriented restorative justice [2008], that without a numerically wider, and societally more proximate audience to which clients can demonstrate positive change through work (i.e. a public community vs. a community of private beneficiaries), the opportunities to forge 'individual-level social capital' that can provide contextual resources and support for that positive change are greatly diminished. Hence why, in the unpaid work observed as part of the CPO, actual ongoing support for clients by beneficiaries post-requirement were rare, and several clients expressed a desire to perform unpaid work for 'actual communities', typically defined by factors more reflective of the geographical areas in which clients lived.

Due to park closure, the group I observed had instead been assigned to a care home for the elderly, albeit only for a single day. Their attitude towards the clients was markedly different from the beneficiaries at Argyll or Montrose Park: they told the clients what they 'want' the clients to do - clearing the care home garden of weeds and dead plants - and left a collection of tools and waste disposal bags in a nearby pile which 'should have everything [they] need'. Following

their initial, brusque assignment of the task, the beneficiaries (the care home manager and several administrative staff) left the clients to get on with their work.

Indeed, there were several instances where beneficiaries' initial framing of tasks was so perfunctory and mechanical that they seemed to border on disregard, if not exploitation. Even from such a short interaction, the atmosphere of this project was profoundly altered from those at either of the parks. Rather than being normalised, respected, and even welcomed for their beneficial impact on the site, clients were given the impression of being a resource to be used. Instead of occupying the role of a pseudo-employee, for all its advantages and disadvantages, clients were instead positioned as subordinate; the hierarchy implicit in beneficiaries requesting a task of clients instead became explicit, framing the relationship as one of commanded obedience, rather than requested instruction. As a result, rather than the initial stages of client engagement with the work on a more meaningful level, the work was done merely to fulfil a mandate. Clients did not feel they existed within a contributive framework, and even the absence of clear parameters, requirements and expectations hindered any greater involvement in the work. There was no determination, or sense of constructive contribution; the work was done because it was instructed to be done, the sole framework to it being the beneficiaries' mandate.

Experiences such as this served to highlight the importance of the beneficiaries' framing, both in the broader, more abstract sense of where they relationally positioned clients, but also in how they set up given tasks on a day-by-day basis. Making a client feel normalised as opposed to subordinate had the effect, deliberate or otherwise, of dulling the client's perception of unpaid work as a court-ordered requirement; this, in turn, opened the door to engaging with tasks on a level beyond formal obligation, supported by clients tying those tasks into clear rationales and standards.

As a final note with regards to the beneficiary framework, it is

important to acknowledge the absence of any punitive perception even in instances of perfunctory beneficiary framing: beneficiaries did not dichotomise their interests with those of clients, constructing a zero-sum calculation whereby clients' harsher treatment or denial of rights somehow results in increased benefit or a satisfying spectacle [Weaver, 2011]. While it may not fully epitomise the co-production model against which Weaver contrasts such a bifurcation, the beneficiary framework does vitally emphasise a mutual relationship between the client and the beneficiary. Within an admittedly organised, sanction-based system, the client/beneficiary dynamic is nevertheless one that encourages clients to assume responsibility in realising the outcomes of unpaid work - far from a penal imposition, the beneficiary framework invites the client to actively collaborate in such a way that the dichotomy between them and the 'beneficiary' is largely negated. Clients in the case study still understood their position within unpaid work sites as that of a court-imposed obligation, and as already noted there were those who would have preferred some recognition of their distinct status; nevertheless, this framework, fictionalising as it may be, prevented any perception of clients as a marginalised or excluded under-class within the work site. The inherent significance of the work was to 'help' the beneficiaries as peer-workers, not to serve them as hierarchical superiors. Clients may not have had an open choice in projects to pursue, but that does not mean an important facet of power was not devolved to them in being asked to work symbolically (and sometimes literally) alongside beneficiaries: the incorporation into a collective, if not an outright community, united by a shared sense and pursuit of benefit for the physical space they inhabited together.

On the other hand, however, it may be argued that the absence of a positively, reparatively framed concept of explicit punishment frustrates any effort to engage clients in unpaid work as a moral enterprise - for instance, a symbolic effort to repay their debt and/or restore themselves to a member of a community [McNeill, 2010]. Without that reparative rationale within the

framework, unpaid work risks becoming an ungrounded, quasi-random act of positive contribution, without any clear personal normative underpinning or performative symbolism to clients. Conversely, such an ungrounded stance may support a more integrative-oriented rationale, supporting a social reality more focussed on mutual support, proactive construction, and valued identity, than predetermined debt and obligation [McIvor, 2004] (although, as already noted, without the recognition of criminogenesis within the client/beneficiary interaction, such a reality is at best random happenstance).

Part 2 - Odd-Jobs vs. Meaningful Work

The staff at Montrose Park had recently gone through a significant pruning of all their major flora, and as a result the leftover detritus was taking up a considerable section of the park as a temporary dumping ground. Given not only the manpower required to move the accumulated branches, bushes and brambles, but the time to convey such to the dumping site on the edge of town, they asked the unpaid work team to clear it instead. The work was simple, if unwieldy (miscellaneous natural waste is not easily carried en masse, and even with protective gloves cuts and scrapes amassed along forearms), but the beneficiaries could not express greater gratitude both during the work, and when they surveyed the clear parkland afterwards. Repeatedly explaining their limited staff and the amount of time it would have taken to make repeated round trips to the dump, they reiterated how helpful the clients had been.

This was the term most commonly associated with unpaid work: beneficiaries viewed the clients, and the work they performed, as 'helpful'. Similarly, clients most positively responded to work they viewed as being 'helpful', either to the beneficiaries or members of the public. As already discussed, there was no sense of reparation influencing the dynamic

between the two stakeholders - no perspective of clients repairing a harm inflicted, or symbolically redeeming themselves from a wrongdoing. Clients understood that they were obligated to attend unpaid work because of their offending behaviour, but there was a conceptual line drawn between the attendance of a work shift, and the work carried out on that shift. In the mutual absence of any punitive, moral or judgemental discourse, the practical value of the work was instead elevated to serve as the key determinant of interactions: clients were perceived, and as a result came to perceive themselves, as rendering a service that made a useful, valuable and positive contribution to the beneficiary. Beneficiaries responded to clients thus not as creditors wiping away a debt, or an injured party restored to the status quo ante, but as important contributors to their shared space. This, in turn, served to propagate the initial catalyst of client engagement; when beneficiaries made explicit the value and helpfulness that their work represented, the sense of obligation associated with attendance was subsumed beneath a consequent perception of themselves as valued and helpful.

That is not to say, however, that the specific nature of individual tasks assigned to clients did not enhance or frustrate this engagement process. The right assignment could have clients feeling almost indistinguishable from work site staff, working alongside them as colleagues under a shared effort to improve a shared space; other assignments, though, could strip away any constructive sense of contribution, reducing client involvement to base mechanical effort as clients counted the hours remaining on their order.

The challenge came from the fact that beneficiaries' dominant perception when selecting and assigning work for clients demonstrated a fundamental bias: their overarching priority was a question of what work needed to be done, rather than what work might have the best value for engaging clients. 'Helpful' was understood unilaterally, and what constituted helpful for beneficiaries did not necessarily involve work that facilitated its translation into client engagement. Whilst even in such cases beneficiaries would frame the assigned work as something that 'needed doing', the nature

of such work acted as a practical block for clients to perceive it, and thus themselves, as having any meaningful value or making any appreciable, positive contribution.

Comparing the nature of unpaid work observed as part of the Community Payback Order with more historic Scottish community service, a set of interesting distinctions and similarities become apparent. Drawing on McIvor's landmark research in the field [1992], it is interesting to note the effect of the CPO's shift away from more public engagement. The nature of the beneficiary has changed from ordinary citizens to a quasi-employer, and as a result one of the key determinants of positive client perception - that their work has been worthwhile, interesting or enjoyable - is no longer that constructive contact. Although in many ways the private beneficiary has taken on much of the relational significance - trust, confidence and especially appreciation [McIvor, 1998] - the work itself was perceived in a much less relational sense, with its inherent nature as a valuable, meaningful contribution required to shoulder the burden of value and engagement (or, in certain cases, failing to do so). Although the work's benefit to members of the public did serve a role both in the initial framing and, as will be discussed later, the outcome of the work, the nature of CPO's work as more remote from the public, rather than bringing them into direct contact with clients through the work, does remove a key activator for client engagement. Rather than the intrinsic value to recipients serving as an affective factor [McIvor, 2010], CPO unpaid work was more concerned with the impact of such value upon clients' own perceptions: whether or not the work had an inherent significance of contribution (within which the recipients served as an ancillary factor), rather than any relational development.

As it was coming to the end of the school year, Montrose Park was anticipating visits from several primary school classes over the coming fortnight. Consequently, several staff were assigned to 'childproof' the park, and the unpaid work clients were incorporated into this effort by

being asked to weed the major pathways through the park so they were free of nettles. The beneficiaries explained that it was a yearly priority of theirs to minimise the likelihood of a child getting stung, but that the task of weeding nettles was better suited to a group, such as the clients. While they had been given a clear justification for the work, the actual task of weeding itself quickly became the all-encompassing focus of the clients: bent over or knelt upon the footpaths, inching along the verge and carefully tearing out any nettles discovered. More than just uncomfortable and frustrating - when either a stubborn nettle refused to be uprooted, or managed to graze an exposed wrist in the process - the focus demanded in rooting through the parkland brought with it a kind of mindlessness. Clients weren't concerned with the value of the job, or its positive contribution; the work denied them the opportunity to consider any facet of their role greater than their performance. By the end of the shift, a considerable portion of the park's footpaths were nettle-free, but clients felt not only sore, but that they had actually accomplished very little, despite the gratitude of the beneficiaries.

'Odd-jobs' like these, as I came to term them in my observational notes, were basic tasks assigned to clients out of a sense of beneficiary necessity. While they had a clear value to beneficiaries in their completion, the actual nature of the work itself limited clients' perception of it as constructive or contributive work in two critical ways.

Typically the work was of a basic, mechanical nature that neither required client engagement nor allowed it - physically demanding or repetitive work which instead demanded clients focus on their actions, with no opportunity for the task's value. Clients, as a result, were more preoccupied with the rigours of doing the work than its value, even in situations where beneficiaries explained it to them; after several hours of weeding, none of the clients cared that their efforts would prevent visiting school children from

getting stung, since they were too sore and concerned with avoiding exposure to the nettles themselves. Even in retrospect, once such odd-jobs were completed, tiredness and relief tarnished any effort to reflect upon such work further.

But more than simply the physical nature of these odd-jobs, it was the context in which they existed that limited client engagement with them. Odd-jobs, in the eyes of clients with whom I discussed them, simply didn't matter. Nettles would grow back eventually. A brook cleared of leaves would only get clogged up again come autumn. Clearing out a junk pile would only lead to further junk being stored there in the near future. Clients derived no sense of contribution from odd-jobs because they felt they contributed nothing: such tasks were interminable, lacking any distinct end-point, and thus denying clients a necessary perception of progression or achievement. Even something as simple as clearing a temporary field of branches and other natural detritus rose above the doldrums of the odd-job because there was a clear, visible sense of progression, and even when a single team didn't manage to clear it all in a day's work, they looked upon the field before leaving and discussed whether they were closer to halfway done, or two thirds. The finite nature of the task, and the knowledge that beneficiaries wouldn't refill the field with yet more detritus, allowed clients to measure how close to completion they were, and thus create a sense of achievement and contribution. By contrast, the team assigned to weeding a path, even when that path was ostensibly clear of nettles, felt only a provisional sense of completion - not only was there little clear indication of their efforts, but they knew that soon the nettles would regrow and their work would be negated.

As already indicated, beneficiaries did see, and express, a value to even basic odd-jobs, and so there existed a disjunction in interactions between the two stakeholders, wherein clients felt their time wasn't being used meaningfully, whilst beneficiaries continued to communicate their appreciation for what they perceived as a useful contribution (even if that contribution was tackling a time-consuming and/or demanding task, leaving

staff free to carry out other work). Due to the challenge being inherent to the nature of the work, however, this disjunction could not be remedied through beneficiary framing, or even ongoing dynamics between the two stakeholders during the work itself (regular expressions of clients' progress and positive contribution). It was not the case that clients refused to engage with the work, but rather that the work lacked the necessary features for engagement. At best, the shared social reality that both stakeholders could construct was a sense of persistence and endurance, but even in such cases the demanding, indefinite nature of odd-jobs diminished any sense of accomplishment or triumph over the challenge.

These odd-jobs can be contrasted with much more engaging, meaningful work clients were often involved with: typically some form of construction work, requiring more than mechanical effort from clients, involving a degree of care, creativity and reflectivity, and leading to a more tangible result. Meaningful work - more commonly referred to by clients as 'good' or 'proper' work - was the antithesis of odd-jobs: tasks were clear and finite, the physical work had a substantive sense of progression, and the consequences made a long-lasting contribution to the site.

Montrose Park boasted a small children's play area, surrounded on two sides by a long, single bench for parents to sit and relax. After several years of wear, the paint on the bench was beginning to thin, and it was resulting in water damage to the wood beneath, and so the beneficiaries asked clients to give it a fresh set of coats. While the actual physical demands of the task were simple, clients eagerly set to the task, and maintained a positive engagement with it over the course of almost four hours. During this time, clients discussed with one another whether their assigned sections of the bench had sufficient coatings, and commented on the evenness of each others' brushing. When the group broke for lunch, they paused to survey their progress and expressed opinions like "that's coming together well"

and "looking good, isn't it?" (to which I was able to reply, in all sincerity, that indeed it was).

Meaningful work was typically of a constructive or maintenance nature: building an archery range or cattle pen, or repairing a section of damaged pathway. The positive significance of building or repairing something is a discussion best saved for later, but one facet of this effort is significant for discussing the nature of unpaid work: 'good work, well done' was how one client described it to me. Drawing on the previous section's discussion surrounding beneficiary framing, a clearly-explained task could create a sense of focus and purpose for clients, which in turn could act as an initial catalyst for their engagement with the work beyond the fundamental level of physical action. Meaningful work helped to generate that catalysed process: no less hard or physically demanding, but the act of carrying it out incorporated elements that bonded clients to their work. Judging where best to place a bordering log in an archery range, or working out whether they had given a bench sufficient coats of paint, all activated clients' perceptions in a critical faculty; work was not a binary process of effort in, result out, but incorporated a variable of quality that, in turn, invited clients to ask whether their effort met a desirable level of said quality. Consequently, as the task proceeded, client effort - both physical and in rising to meet this invitation of quality - was reciprocated with tangible/visible results, generating a perception of meaningful action and accomplishment in clients because of their input.

Clients were highly sensitive to what made work 'good' or 'proper' versus what constituted 'boring' work (i.e. work that was, or wasn't, worth their engagement on a level beyond physical action). What distinguished, for instance, painting a bench as proper work from washing dishes as boring work was an abstract sense of value, benefit and positive impact; clients wanted work with a purpose, because purpose allowed for 'good work, well done' - it created a goal to meet, and a reason for meeting it (an archery

range or bench had to be of a sufficient standard, because members of the public were going to use them). By contrast, odd-jobs such as raking up leaves or clearing litter carried not only a sense of futility, as the mess would simply return and thus clients' efforts lacked meaningful consequence, but the goal was an absolute state and the underlying reason ephemeral.

While this may appear, at first instance, to be a highly individualised process exclusive to clients, beneficiaries did have an important interactive part to play - not only in the initial framing of meaningful work, but acting as a mirror to clients' efforts. Their ongoing expression of the work's value, as well as intermittent check-ups and provisional feedback for client efforts, all reinforced the importance of the work and, consequently, the importance of the clients as workers. But this required invested effort on the beneficiary's part: a generic 'thank you' or 'this is going great' wasn't enough to reinforce and enhance client engagement; clients were sensitive to the sincerity of a beneficiary's appreciation, and the nature of whether beneficiaries were watching them to gauge the quality of the work. It took beneficiaries to actually look at the work being done and express its positive nature in specific, consequent terms for clients to fully derive a sense of pride in their work they did, and in themselves for doing it.

In this regard, early community service theory [Young, 1979] can be drawn upon to reconcile the difficulty of the CPO's reparative rationale. While neither clients nor beneficiaries (and certainly not the public ignorant to the entire undertaking) perceived the work being carried out by clients as some sort of 'repair' for damage inflicted by their wrongdoing, that is not to say that the work did not possess some symbolic and performative weight to it. Although neither a moral redemption or integration of social order, this idea of tangible contribution was one of the key positive factors in clients' perception of meaningful unpaid work; rather than contributing to a sense of atonement/awareness of wrongdoing [Duff, 2001] (or even titular 'payback'), the experience of providing some palpable benefit to the beneficiaries and their consequent public not only encouraged active participation in the work

amongst clients, but as will be seen later served as a critical factor in the resulting consequences of the work's completion. In the absence of any perceived reparative rationale to motivate unpaid work, contribution served arguably a more challenging function of taking clients from a state of *ex nihilo* to one of participation and even normative engagement in the work. As will be seen, the symbolic process that emerged from this was one of largely performance to the client's own self, reinforced by beneficiaries' feedback and the unwitting symbolic of public enjoyment of the work's result.

In terms of the unpaid work's interactive process, there is also an interesting parallel to be drawn between the performative aspects of observed CPO projects and Rex and Gelsthorpe's evaluation of community service pathfinder projects [2002]. Drawing on pro-social modelling, the theory argues for an exploitation of 'a natural environment' to develop 'socially responsible behaviour' in clients: completion of tasks, teamwork and developmental learning accomplished through engagement with the work. Thus normative developments, such as a sense of achievement and increased self-esteem, serve as a medium by which the performance of work encourages clients' personal change (cf. Frayne [1993], and the idea of personal growth through clients' realisation of their 'positive potential'). The challenge with such a performative dynamic, however, is its highly insular nature to the client, leaving the beneficiary's role as little more than a facilitative role model, relegated to instructing them in tasks and encouraging them towards engagement, or a symbolic actor to enhance clients' sense of valuable contribution.

Bottoms' typology of unpaid work [2008] may, in turn, offer some insight into the limited nature of the CPO's unpaid work, especially with regards to clients' wider societal contexts and challenges. For example, borrowing Bottoms' rehabilitative model, client contact with the public beneficiaries of unpaid work can have a positively transformative effect that lays valuable normative groundwork for rehabilitation; by contrast, however, the lack of follow-through and organisational commitment towards social links

(both on the part of the CPO and beneficiary groups) limits the long-term, reintegrative potential of such contact between the stakeholders. In a similar vein, Bottoms' envisaged 'civil renewal and community engagement' model also struggles to find traction with the CPO: given the arms-length to which members of the public are kept, with beneficiaries acting as the more immediate stakeholder in unpaid work whilst clients are hidden in plain sight from park visitors, it cannot realistically be said that unpaid work engages any sense of community by 'involving local people in solving local problems'. While Bottoms' vision of unpaid work's symbolic value through 'positive control signals' is paralleled in the observed CPO projects by meaningful work, in such instances the symbolism is directed towards the clients conducting the work, rather than any public audience there-to. In simplest terms, Bottoms' model is predicated on, crucially, visible unpaid work; the unpaid work observed as part of the CPO can, however, be readily described as invisible. As a result, the work struggles to fulfil any integrative rationale - without the public perceiving either a symbolic performance, or being collaboratively engaged through the work itself, it isn't possible for them to be engaged as supportive stakeholders in clients' social integration. Instead, as has been noted, this responsibility falls to the beneficiaries of unpaid work, but due to the normalisation of clients, the logical (and ethical) consequent significance of unpaid work - that clients' deserve support in what should be a new identity as a positive citizen [Raynor, 2001] - goes unrealised.

Given the relative ease with which the CPO does not conform to Bottoms' third typological model [2008] - vengeance - there is only one model left: the 'new market state'. Obviously, the CPO's unpaid work requirement is not obligated to conform to this fourfold typology, but given the challenges and limitations of client/offender interactions discussed in this chapter, this final model does hold some value in explicating unpaid work. The idea of the client as some kind of market actor working within a system that, at the macro-level, is motivated at least in part by economic responsivity would explain several of the CPO's key features, both on a policy and

observed practical level: the centrality of public selection and nomination of work projects, the absence of engagement with any meaningful concept of 'community', and the reduction of ordinary citizens to the role of unpaid work spectator (diminished even further in the CPO by virtue of unpaid work being invisible). Indeed, the CPO's unpaid work requirement expands this idea of the market state by constructing the client as a quasi-employee, able to be easily integrated into a range of public and private organisations as an unskilled labourer to supplement their existing workforce at limited extra cost (and the local authority bearing that financial burden by providing transportation, management and even a degree of equipment). While on an interpersonal level, beneficiaries and clients can still achieve meaningful interaction through the symbolic medium of individual work projects - respectively framing and engaging with tasks that help to build a client's sense of self - the wider policy and political context of the CPO hamstrings that interaction. The limited scope and ambition of unpaid work as a socio-economic enterprise means little support for more long-term, integrative and reintegrative human and social capital.

While much of unpaid work - both odd-jobs and meaningful work - was physically demanding, focussing on the exertion of manual labour rather than specialist crafts or skills, its demanding nature was never a focus of either beneficiaries or clients. The mechanical nature of odd-jobs did, as already set out, serve as a roadblock to deeper client engagement, and clients would on occasion complain about the rigours of a particular task. But that did not mean that hardship or any demanding quality came to define their perception of unpaid work or their place within it. Clients understood the nature of the 'fine on time', which carried the punitive burden for the entirety of unpaid work; while work was frequently demanding, they did not perceive that as by deliberate design, rather it was simply an unavoidable facet of physical work.

Beneficiaries, likewise, did not factor the demanding nature of the work into their perception of it. At no point did beneficiaries express, either to me or to clients, that any particularly arduous task was purposefully hard (i.e. falling

beneath a rubric of 'toughening' or 'disciplining'). Rather, beneficiaries frequently checked on the status of clients, ensuring their physical state and encouraging them to take breaks whenever they felt the need. More than just a concern for health and safety, these check-ups continued to foster the pseudo-employee dynamic between the two stakeholders - clients weren't there to be pushed or taken advantage of, but to contribute services like any (admittedly, largely unskilled) worker. Clients themselves recognised this: only on a few occasions across the four month observational period did clients think beneficiaries were asking too much of them, and even on these occasions they did not believe such requests were part of a wider punitive effort (most often, they were the retrospective product of frustration at some challenge faced in the task at hand); on the other hand, however, it was only rarely that clients took advantage of beneficiaries' open policy of breaks, exceeding the remit of rest and recovery and entering into 'slacking off' territory (again, typically when faced with some challenge, which will be discussed further in the next chapter). What this would seem to indicate is that, while a punitive perception did not define the shared social reality between the two stakeholders, a mutual degree of professional perception did: clients were to be respected and afforded provisions as workers, but clients reciprocated that by not (with some exceptions) allowing those provisions to interfere with the delivery of their work.

Indeed, far from clients wanting to avoid work as a prevailing norm, the far more common perception amongst clients was a preference for spending their time in active work, as opposed to 'standing around doing nothing' without an assigned task. Clients believed, and would frequently express in instances where beneficiaries were slow to assign new tasks, that if they were going to be obliged to travel out to a park to work for several hours a week, they would actually prefer to do some work rather than stand about idly wasting their time. This tied into the fundamental client preoccupation, both in their discussions with each other and their check-ins with social workers: how many hours they had remaining on their orders. While their universal

preoccupation with, quite literally, counting the hours until they were done might seem at first instance to be an indication of reluctance and a lack of deeper engagement, in practice their interest in their time remaining actually enhanced this desire to spend it actively at least, and meaningfully at best. Days where work was sparse, slow or of a basic, odd-job nature resulted in clients, during the ride back to the social work centre, punctuating their check of their remaining hours with groans and expressions of boredom - the prospect of however many hours doing more work like that was a disheartening proposition. On the other hand, on days where clients had felt their time had been used productively and positively, the progression of their time remaining was seen as a step forward - focussed less on the actual time they had left, and the amount they had cleared that day. This served as a valuable gateway into clients' deeper norms and values: the desire for a productive use of time was capable of supporting the greater momentum of engagement with meaningful work.

Much as in McIvor's research [1992], observed participants perceived the inconvenience and commitment of regular attendance, absent remuneration, as the punitive quality of unpaid work (the 'fine on time' theory), leaving both the work itself and the beneficiaries responsible for organising and assigning it free to focus on more positive significance. Even odd-jobs, limited as they were in perceptual value, were not regarded by clients as a punishment, or imposed for punitive reasons. In this sense, the CPO maintains continuity from the early foundations of community service [Young, 1979]; although it may even be said that the CPO is less punitive than early visions of the disposal, with the concept of 'discipline' being absent from both client and beneficiary perceptions, replaced by the client's motivation to work as either a foil to time-wasting boredom or an engaged pseudo-professional commitment to quality.

The Act of Working - Meaningful Engagement and Contextual Constraints

Despite the differences between unpaid work and supervision, the core driver of interaction is remarkably similar for both. Once again, the client serves as the central focus of an effort to transform their perception of the requirement from a court-mandated necessity to be endured, into an opportunity for positive growth. The critical difference between unpaid work and supervision is that the latter enjoys the advantages of what might be described as communicative purity: human engagement and individualised dialogue serve as the primary leverage for interaction and the mutual construction of supervision's shared reality, with practical action serving either as a consequence or supplement. By contrast, unpaid work must utilise the inverse formula: it is through practical action that beneficiaries and clients construct a shared reality, shaped by the nature of the work as either determined compliance or engaged normative growth, with interpersonal relationships serving a supplementary role in rare instances. The challenge with this inversion is that by staking so much of the interaction, and consequent reality construction, upon the unpaid work itself, beneficiaries and clients find themselves significantly more vulnerable to the determinations of the CPO's wider context. While supervision was marked by exceptions to rules and individualised responses courtesy of the interpersonal dynamic at its heart, unpaid work must take account of considerable more, and greater, preconditions as its stakeholders negotiate what the requirement actually means in practice.

As the first, most obvious, and potentially most significant precondition, the very fact that clients were interacting with semi-private, organisationally-placed individuals as 'beneficiaries', rather than members of the public as 'communities', was a considerable influence upon their interactions. On the one hand, the quasi-professional relationship that formed between the stakeholders in the process of unpaid work could serve as a mutually respectful, indeed normalising, foundation upon which client engagement could be built; such a relationship could not be established if the interactive dynamic was calibrated for clients and members of the public. By

contrast, however, this client/beneficiary dynamic was also limiting: the erasure of the client's offending within this quasi-professional relationship, and the absence of an explicitly reparative rationale to the work (more readily facilitated if unpaid work cleaved to the Order's 'community payback' rhetoric) did not only limit the symbolic weight of the work, but also its practical consequences. With regards to the former, while the quasi-professional relationship did create a space wherein clients could generate their own internal meanings about the work - building engagement and a consequent positive sense of self from the value of the work engaged with - the external meanings of such work were limited. The benefit to beneficiaries will come to serve a significant role in later chapters, but this must be contrasted with the reparative value and more personal, non-economic significance such work could have (and, in past research on community sentencing, has had) on members of the public instead.

It is also worth noting that, while this does not divorce unpaid work from wider, non-locative notions of 'community' [Brownlee, 1998; Worrall and Hoy, 2005], it does make a significant distinction from some major points of literature reference. Most notably is McIvor's research [1992; 1998], wherein the external, relational dividends of interaction with public beneficiaries are replaced by internal transformations in a client's own self-perception as a result of the work. While such motivational, identity-centric aspects are strengths from an initial desistance stance [McNeill, 2004], it does vindicate the critique of the (organisational) beneficiary's role as an ancillary facilitator [Frayne, 1993]. When contrasted with the common depiction of the public as a valuable resource and partner in fostering social capital [Bazemore and Boba, 2007], this would suggest a lost opportunity.

With regards to the lack of practical consequences of unpaid work, especially concerning social capital, the quasi-professional relationship between client and beneficiary also encountered another contextual limitation in its construction of unpaid work's practical reality: the lack of any wider integrative rationale or process to the work. This relationship, with its

erasure-by-silence of clients' offending and attendant social inequalities, consistently failed to construct meaningful, long-term associations of positive, transformative and supportive value to clients, because there was no clear purpose to such associations beyond the relationship's work-facilitation purpose [Raynor, 2001]. Where beneficiaries did offer ongoing, post-CPO placements and support to clients, it was the product of motivated, well-meaning beneficiaries seeking to provide assistance to clients whose situations or existing skill-sets aligned, by nothing more than happy accident, with the resources beneficiaries had available to them.

That being said, it is perhaps a testament to the interactions between clients and beneficiaries, and the power of unpaid work as a symbolic (and transformative) medium, that a positive social reality could be constructed despite these limitations. Although the requisites of the work assigned were both high and particular, demanding specific tasks and goals to which clients progress, it was nevertheless an achievement that such work could generate in clients perceptions of pride, accomplishment and self-value despite its detachment from a wider, community-based social valuation. Such perceptions were not always consistent, reliant as they were upon the nature of the work, and it is here we can see the most unfortunate breakdown in beneficiaries and clients creating a shared reality for unpaid work: beneficiaries, on the one hand, perceiving odd-jobs to be simple but useful tasks carried out by clients, whereas clients view them as mundane, laborious chores that carry no positive, normative weight. Indeed, there is a sad note of irony to the fact that in a relationship that emphasised the client's normalisation and incorporation into beneficiaries' collective as a pseudo-employee, there was little ability to perceive such task from the other's perspective. While clients were prepared to endure such work - motivated at the most basic level by the desire to reduce their remaining hours for the requirement - the social reality this produces erred uncomfortably close to a genteel redesign of the chain gang in its imposition of menial labour perceived as meaningless by its labourers. That clients had their own

perception of 'good work, well done', and actively preferred spending Order-mandated time contributing to such projects with real impact and positive significance, demonstrated a clear desiderata to which unpaid work may aspire. While the idea of positive, contributive work giving rise to positive, contributive clients does rely upon beneficiaries selecting and framing appropriate tasks, it also returns to the key challenge encountered in this chapter: the need for the wider policy context of the CPO to recognise unfulfilled potential, and take steps to ensure that the act of working is fully supported in realising that potential.

Chapter 9 - The Mood Whilst Working

Unpaid work does not simply happen. It is the product of numerous hours of manual labour, and thus any attempt to understand the social realities produced by the interactions within unpaid work must examine the ongoing atmosphere and dynamics that persist across this span of time. While it is tempting to view, and understand, unpaid work in grander scopes - how it is initially framed, what its aspirations are, or the results of the labour - the ongoing process of physical effort that realises said work contains nuanced facets that are essential in understanding the wider picture.

The challenge with attempting to understand the perceptions of stakeholders in the midst of carrying out assigned tasks - what has been referred to here as 'the mood whilst working' - is that the prevailing social reality is not contained in any rich and complex singular moment, but in a long span of predominantly silent, almost entirely client-inhabited work. Determinants exist in ongoing dynamics of inter-client relationships and their stance towards the assigned task being undertaken.

On the one hand, this challenge presents a unique opportunity. As opposed to the previous and subsequent chapters, the dominant influencer of unpaid work's social reality were the clients themselves: their perceptions and interactions with one another free of prevailing beneficiary influence. This afforded them a unique opportunity, in that the vast majority of time spent carrying out unpaid work (if not the most 'defining' moments) were theirs to shape. As a result, there are fascinating instances where positive, constructive client relationships sat on the cusp of harnessing unpaid work as a locus for a tentative, self-forged community of mutual support. On the other hand, however, the nature of unpaid work and clients' stance towards it was often such that this opportunity was not capitalised upon, with clients' focus upon completing the work producing a null social reality, open for others to project their own perceptions onto a blank canvas.

Part 1 - Graft

Beneficiaries never begrudged the clients a break or additional help beyond initial set-up and ongoing check-up. Whilst clearing out a disused lot of old building materials at Montrose Park, in expectation of later client teams renovating it into a flower bed, the staff were not only understanding of, but actively encouraged, clients taking short, several minute breaks between rounds of carrying brickwork lumps uphill in wheelbarrows to the temporary dumping ground. When several of the provided wheelbarrows proved to have faulty tires, the staff were quick to source working replacements, expressing the view to clients that the job was hard enough without having a busted wheel.

It is important to stress at the outset of this particular theme the context within which it exists. More simply than client safety, client wellbeing was a priority for beneficiaries; beyond simply statutorily-mandated and insurance-preserving measures to protect clients, beneficiaries made sincere efforts to ensure, as far as possible, that tasks assigned to clients did not place undue demand or expectation upon their skills or physical capacities. Although placed as pseudo-employees in a social sense of collective camaraderie, clients were recognised as possessing a reduced level of training and familiarity with the work site - closer to obliged volunteers than a hired service - and as a result while their expectations were not lower for clients, there was a qualitative recognition that certain tasks were either too specialist or physically demanding for them to perform. Beneficiaries were careful to assign tasks that were achievable - with often considerable physical effort, but nothing beyond their capabilities (or, as we'd sometimes joke, even the capabilities of an academic desk jockey). What is crucial to understand is that, while graft was a crucial dynamic in shaping the social reality of unpaid work, between clients and beneficiaries but especially between clients themselves, the demand of the work was never its sole or

dominant significance; work was hard, but neither singularly nor punitively so.

Indeed, as another important precondition in discussing the notion of 'graft' within unpaid work, was the common concern amongst clients of 'fair treatment'. This was a priority amongst clients' perceptions of both individual tasks and the wider obligation of unpaid work as a requirement of their Orders, and one to which they were particularly sensitive. Even the most motivated and open clients would come to begrudge a particular task if they perceived its conditions to be unfair - if they were improperly equipped, given insufficient instruction, or the task demanded both consistent and considerable physical exertion. But perhaps most indicative of all their concerns over 'fair treatment' was clients' concern with the reduction of their hours; namely, that they receive their due time for the work they put in, especially for begrudged tasks. As one client commented during an argument over his remaining hours, it was 'a matter of respect' - with clients not being monetarily recompensed, reduction of hours came to be perceived as an abstract currency, and thus a unit of measurement for work equity. While many clients were prepared to engage with suitable work and recognise some greater value to it beyond this basic exchange of labour for hours, this nevertheless served as a foundational requirement for client perceptions without which graft would not be applied.

As a brief aside, this idea of a clients' remaining hours (and the reduction thereof) presents an interesting reframing of the classic 'fine on time' argument. On the one hand, the client focus on seeing their hours be reduced commensurate to their invested effort does indeed suggest a penal significance: clients were eager to reach the coveted 'zero hours remaining', which suggests that, indeed, loss of their free time was an undesirable state for them [Morris, 1993]. But, on the other hand, the idea of respect - that this reduction of hours was seen as compensation for their labour - demonstrates the considerable extent to which the wider framing of unpaid work, especially the quasi-privatised perception of the clients as hired service for beneficiaries, contained that penal significance from influencing the inherent

nature of the work.

This, then, leads into the fundamental notion of 'graft': the baseline guarantee of not only client compliance, but active participation with which they approached unpaid work. As will be discussed in the subsequent section of this chapter, a more engaged client group could be said to demonstrate a sense of morale that enhanced the work, but even in the absence of this more engaged dynamic, 'graft' was an enduring factor for clients' efforts.

Due to inclement weather at the beginning of summer, several client teams were temporarily moved from their work sites at Argyll and Montrose Parks to 'the workshop' - a large unit at an industrial estate on the edge of the city, where the social work services carried out simple wood- and iron-working jobs for schools and care-homes, constructing or refurbishing park benches, fences and the like. Although there were a few standing orders for the workshop, those had already been allocated to other unpaid work teams, and so the clients with whom I worked were assigned to clearing up the workshop's store of lumber in expectation of autumn (where consistently poor weather required teams to make greater use of the workshop). It was here that the word 'graft' first emerged, used by the team's overseer as the clients hauled metres-long slabs of wood across the workshop floor, systematically transforming a pile of wood into an organised series of cuts and beams. The term was used appreciatively of clients' determination and effort, but it was clear, both from watching and working with them, that this was all the motivation they had. The idea of clearing the workshop out for later teams, and for use at a point in time where they expected to have completed their hours, did not engage the clients in an active or contributive sense. They worked hard because that's what the task required, and because that is what they were expected to. That was the nature of 'graft'.

'Graft', amongst clients' perceptions, was equated with effort: it represented the client's determination and focus to complete a task to a serviceable standard. Even absent a strong reason to do so - that is to say, simply because it was assigned to them, rather than for any engaging consequence (e.g. the building of an archery range for the enjoyment of public visitors) - graft ensured clients would deliver satisfactory work to the clients. The theme seemed to be a logical extension of the clients' perception that doing no work was worse than doing any kind of work: the idea that if no work was 'boring', then by contrast any act of work required a degree of committed effort to, at the very least, occupy the client's attention and pass the time in a productive, if not meaningful, way.

What is particularly challenging about graft, however, is that it was perception neutral, at least with regard to clients. To call the work achieved on graft alone 'mindless' or 'thoughtless' is not intended as an insult, or to otherwise pass judgement on the clients or their efforts, but simply to indicate that such work was largely a product of automation: the exertion of effort with minimal motivation beyond a fundamental compliance to clients' obligation that, whilst on unpaid work, they must execute such work (backed up by the aforementioned avoidance of the real perceived punitive sting of unpaid work: boredom). Thus was the client's priority the completion of work as an end in itself, rather than as a means to any more personal fulfilment (i.e. the achievement of work to which the client has somehow become normatively engaged). One of the analytical tools of this project was the question of how participants made their context relevant to themselves; 'graft' is such a challenge because there was no contextual relevance. Clients simply approached the work with a pragmatic perception of getting it done to get it done.

By contrast, while clients brought little into their interactions and social construction with the notion of graft, beneficiaries implied, and imposed, several contextual relevancies through this baseline theme. Clients were, for instance, expected to act with professional respect to their colleagues, both

other clients and beneficiaries - when one client referred to a female beneficiary at Argyll Park as 'darling', he was informed in no uncertain terms that this was an inappropriate way to address a colleague. Swearing on the worksites, although prevalent, was discouraged when children were in the vicinity. In a similar vein, clients were expected to follow several clear physical requirements to their work: the wearing of high-visibility jackets was one such requirement, whilst the other was a prohibition on leaving the work site during their required hours, even if only to acquire some lunch (clients were encouraged to bring their own ahead of time). The effect was not to exclude clients from the public nature of their work sites, but rather, like beneficiary staff, to create a parallel space: working alongside the public, but clearly distinct from them. Indeed, far from excluding clients, the wearing of high visibility jackets signalled them to the public as sources of knowledge and authority; clients were frequently mistaken for park employees by public visitors, and engaged in informal interactions such as queries about the park or requests for assistance, to which clients invariably responded politely and helpfully. From the beneficiaries' perspective, such requirements were a form of crisis prevention, ensuring clients were identifiable and did not wander off (all of which could jeopardise the ongoing relationship between the organisation and social work services, or risk negative media attention). For clients, however, while the restriction on movement occasionally chafed (especially when clients forgot their lunches), the other requirements imposed upon them were borne in the same spirit of 'graft': a condition with which to comply, requiring neither engagement nor endurance.

What this demonstrates, from the perspective of examining the interactions between the two stakeholders and the social reality they produce, is that there existed a subtle power dynamic between beneficiaries and clients. Beneficiaries were approachable, even affable, but part of clients' understand of 'graft' - of active involvement in the work site - incorporated the recognition that they needed to follow a basic code of appropriate behaviour, as determined by the beneficiaries. While, as the previous chapter suggests,

beneficiaries did not want to exist within, let alone leverage, a hierarchical relationship of authority, preferring to ask for help with a task rather than ordering its completion, there were nevertheless conditions imposed upon clients' involvement as a prerequisite for their attendance on-site. Taken in a broad perspective, the idea of an employer imposing conditions upon an employee in order to maintain access to their employment is nothing radical; but looking at the specific criteria of these conditions - readily-identifiable and distinguishing vests, restriction of movement, and an elevated standard of personal conduct - there is a distinct vein of, if not control, at least regulation incorporated into the theme of 'graft'.

Drawing on early conceptualisations of community service [Morris, 1993] as an introduction to the literature involved in this theme, it is interesting to note the intersection of ideas at which graft sits. At the most obvious level, there is a clear contrast to be drawn between the idea of demanding work as an inherent significance of said work, including the personal discipline required of clients in attending and performing said work, and the more appreciative notion of graft: demanding work is an objective spectacle that in turn produces a client state, while graft was an internal state that in turn produced perceptually neutral work. As already stressed, graft was not a product of work deliberately issued to be demanding or disinteresting; but, curiously, that does not mean that graft-driven unpaid work was not its own kind of spectacle. Rather than beneficiaries defining it by the spectacle of the work (hard, demanding, etc.), however, it was defined by the spectacle of the clients in doing the work (ideas of determination, commitment and the like, regardless of clients' actual perceptual states in so doing).

By contrast, however, when considered from either a reparative or integrative rationale, the apparent internal, perceptual neutrality of graft becomes a challenge: as a theme, graft is unconcerned with whether work is 'boring' or 'rewarding' [Morris, 1993]. While a more modern audience may question Morris' proposition that constructive work can 'replace the 'buzz' of

offending', the idea of satisfaction and engagement through the work conducted by clients is nevertheless crucial, and one that graft, on its own, is ill-suited to achieving. As acknowledged by Morris, the elevation of client work from baseline graft to meaningful action requires some external stake: the dynamic of teamwork, a sense of contribution, or the value to beneficiaries (whether formal or public). The consequence for graft, however, is that while it can be enhanced, as a fundamental feature of clients' experience of unpaid work it contributes to neither rationale; clients exhibiting graft on its own do not perceive their work to be reparative, contributive, or facilitative of new social ties, but rather an inert task to be completed. Neither 'boring' nor 'rewarding', 'punitive' or 'positive', 'reparative' or 'integrative'; any demand or discipline is purely physical, and clients' mental states are engaged only to the extent of performing assigned tasks.

It is, as a result, tempting to view 'graft' as the nihilistic repertoire of unpaid work: the default client stance that endures when unpaid work fails to engage their normative framework, augmented by beneficiary preconditions. To an extent, this may indeed have been the case for many clients across numerous days of unpaid work. As has already been discussed, the fundamental concern of clients regarding their unpaid work was the reduction of their remaining hours, and at the end of a given day, regardless of the significance they perceived their work as having, provided they cannot be accused of having put in an insufficient quality of work (and thus potentially risk breach proceedings), then both their requirement and their basic motivation have been fulfilled. 'Graft', by this conceptualisation, was in many ways the absence of perception - an endurance of determined action in spite of any higher reason to act. From such a perspective, in terms of interaction and subsequent reality construction, graft would represent clients surrendering their involvement in the shared enterprise, leaving beneficiaries to determine and define their shared space whilst focussing singularly on the task of getting the work done for done's sake.

Therefore, let us consider the perception of beneficiaries, and what

meanings they generated in the absence of client perception. Interestingly, in situations where clients did not generate any sense of constructive or positive contribution concerning the work they performed, beneficiaries would often do so on their behalf. 'Graft' was met with congratulations and thanks for clients 'putting their backs into it' or 'getting through a hard day's work'. While for clients, graft may have represented a neutral state of necessity, for beneficiaries this focus on completing work regardless of challenge or lack of engagement was something more valorised: determination if not dedication, endurance if not engagement. Beneficiaries seemed to recognise that certain tasks, like pulping pruned tree branches for fresh wood chippings, were not tasks that clients (or anyone else) could generate deeper or personal meaning from, and so the worth came from the commitment to do the task regardless. Ironically, the absence of higher motivation amongst clients to do the work was perceived as a positive quality by beneficiaries for clients doing the work regardless.

Even if clients acted only because it was required of them to reduce their hours, and even manual labour was preferable to idle boredom, that did not mean the work was absent significance; after all, clients did not hold a monopoly on the meaning of their own work, as it was conducted on behalf of beneficiaries. Even odd-jobs, while lacking any points of engagement for clients, were nevertheless assigned by beneficiaries because their completion was of some benefit/relevance to them. Indeed, for such assignments, beneficiaries were typically clear and emphatic in their distinction of the value clients' efforts had; even in instances where clients spent an entire work shift weeding paths or clearing storage sheds, beneficiaries would offer some degree of sincere thanks, and explain just how helpful their efforts had been.

Over the course of a hot summer's afternoon, a client team at Montrose Park spent three hours repairing a layer of chicken wire laid down to provide traction for a series of wooden stairs frequently used

by park visitors. This frequent use has left the wiring patchy, loose and jagged in places, making sections hazardous due to slipping or tripping. The team's assigned task was to nail down old sections of wire that had come loose and untangle any jagged knots they encountered (and extend their coverage, if possible). The work was uncomfortable, the focus required to scan the repetitive expanse of wiring across every step for looseness or gaps was monotonous, and there was little discernable payoff for their efforts. However, at the end of the day, when the beneficiary who had assigned the task looked over the team's results, she expressed not only a sincere (and considerable) degree of gratitude, but explained the specific value of the task. The staff at the park had grown concerned as to the health and safety risk of the steps, and with an impending inspection its repair may very well have spared the park some considerable degree of official difficulty.

From an intersubjective vantage point, this particular encounter was both fascinating and highly indicative of 'graft' as an interactive theme. While clients may have viewed their work, when operating purely on graft, as meaningless, this does not mean it was so. Both the work, and by extension the clients as workers, were still viewed in a positive and appreciative light by beneficiaries. Their own perceptive repertoires gave them a profoundly different perspective on assigned tasks. For clients, the wire repair job was uncomfortable and repetitive, whilst for beneficiaries it was a vital solution to an impending problem. While constructive work was able to create some middle ground through the clients' normative engagement with the work as a symbolic, performative task, odd-jobs and their attendant graft resulted in this disparity of perception that left beneficiaries expressing gratitude to a disinterested client team.

The reason for this disparity is obvious (although the solution less so): it is a matter of context. A client brought in to a particular site for six hours a

week had little insight into it as an ongoing, dynamic setting with its own employees, concerns, priorities and struggles. Informal contact with beneficiaries did help to moderately lift this shroud, as the exchange of personal information between both parties allowed beneficiaries to better understand clients' ordinary lives, and clients to understand beneficiaries' involvement in the day-to-day tasks of their work setting. But to borrow a neologism from John Koenig [2017], 'sonder' - the profound realisation that every stranger has a life as complex as one's own, which they are constantly living despite one's personal lack of awareness of it - was never achieved. The realisation was, ultimately, a lack of incorporation between clients and beneficiaries. These moments of informal contact were too infrequent and too informal; without full inclusion as members of the setting, even on a weekly basis, clients were kept out of the loop on crucial contextual understanding that would have facilitated a mutuality of perception, allowing clients to better approach even perceived odd-jobs from a shared sense of priority and value (whilst also creating deeper social ties with beneficiaries that might have facilitated social capital and opportunities).

However, in the absence of any further engagement with tasks assigned as part of unpaid work, it cannot be said that clients experienced any greater complexity or meaning to said work. Ideas of overcoming obstacles, taking responsibility for their offending, being encouraged to live in a law-abiding manner, or even developing an empathic understanding of other vulnerable groups [Rex, 2002 & 2004] were all rendered unattainable by the sole presence of 'graft' as a client perceptual theme. Unlike the significance of punitive spectacles, where at least it can be said a client is enduring an expressed denunciation regardless of their own perceptual state [Pamment and Ellis, 2010], these more complex symbols require client involvement. Symbolic performance cannot be made without the client expressing something, and a collaborative process cannot be achieved when there is no one with whom to engage. Without that involvement, let alone engagement, unpaid work is simply that: just work, without any consequent

constructed meaning. Loftier collaborative concepts of 'paying back by working at change' - developing both human capital in skills-building and addressing risk factors, as well as fostering social support - are recognised as requiring client 'opt-in' [McNeill, 2009]. Even setting aside the external resourcing required for a more desistance-oriented integration, a purely normative conceptualisation such as Duff's communicative punishment [2003] still requires the client to regard the work (i.e. punishment) on a more complex level than a pragmatic task to be completed, requiring reflection, confrontation and transformation in their internal self-perceptions.

This mutuality between clients and beneficiaries was not completely undeveloped in unpaid work, however. One subtle facet demonstrated a nascent mutuality of perception: the fact that beneficiaries were also working, if not directly alongside clients on the same task, at least within sight of them. At no point during my observations did clients ever express resentment towards beneficiaries for a disparity in their respective work (with the exception of occasionally feeling that they were receiving more menial tasks, but even then clients never saw beneficiaries as taking it easy off clients' efforts). This contributed to the discursive notion of graft, elevating it a step to become a shared sense of effort not just between clients as a necessity of work, but between clients and beneficiaries as part of the work site's continuity. Perceived thus by clients, the shared social reality became one in which both stakeholder parties exercised some degree of physical effort - of graft - which not only negated any sense of isolation, negative stigma or punitive clients may have otherwise felt, but also leveraged group censure against any client who chose to shirk their share of the work. While odd-jobs may still have lacked any greater meaning in and of themselves, the work itself could at least be elevated, with clients' consciously demonstrating focus and determination - 'putting your back into it', as one described it to me. No longer mindless automation, but the start of a feedback loop of effort-to-result that could, with further nurturing through the right tasks and beneficiary input, help clients generate normative engagement with their work.

This, in turn, helped to translate graft into an intermediate, and indeed supportive, state. Even in situations where clients were engaged in meaningful work, the morale such work generated was not sufficient in and of itself to maintain focus and dedication towards the task. There invariably came a moment of strain within a given task where even a sense of positivity, construction or self-value could not, on its own, push a wheelbarrow full of wooden logs up a hill for the tenth time, or keep digging through a layer of concrete foundation with a pickaxe. In such situation, it was this enhanced notion of graft - focus and determination - that kept clients pushing onwards.

Part 2 - Morale and Client Investment

Beyond the fundamental dimension of clients' graft, there operated a higher element to their mood whilst working that came into effect only in the correct circumstances. The most appropriate term for this is 'morale' - not to be interpreted simply as a positive mood (although that does factor into the phenomenon), but rather a purposive investment in the assigned task that goes beyond the simple, physical requirements of its completion. Drawing upon discussion in the previous chapter, this investment was small at first, such as an assigned goal or set of standards generating a sense of determination and value, or the contextual value of a task generating a corresponding sense of contribution. But as the work progressed, so too did clients' morale, transforming their perception of the work, and by extension its meaning within the wider context of unpaid work. By the completion of the task, clients' investment had grown said task into both a communicative medium and a catalyst for personal development.

Clearing away cut branches, bushes and other natural waste following Montrose Park's annual trimming-back was far from a constructive exercise. Nevertheless, it gave rise to some of the strongest morale I witnessed over the course of my observational period. Not only did the

task have a readily apparent goal with an obvious sense of progression - transfer the finite mass of waste from a field to the team's van for transportation to the dump - but in carrying out this task the client team demonstrated the investment-developing power of, as they called it, 'good banter'. The work was not performed in silence: while clients frequently discussed matters regarding their personal lives that didn't pertain to the work, a considerable portion of their casual interaction with one another was focussed on the task at hand. Organising how best to carry cumbersome loads of branches, guiding each other through the rest of the park to prevent any scrapes or other damage to its facilities, comparing cuts inflicted to our forearms by brambles and thorns. The collaboration was more than just necessity; it came to be the defining feature of the work, bringing everyone together into a shared spirit of effort, so that at the end of the day when the team drove a considerable portion of the waste to the dump, they commented on how much of the field they had cleared with an obvious sense of pride.

Although not the defining element of morale, client positivity did have a crucial and complex role to play within its development: at once both a product and nurturing factor within the cyclical growth of morale. As one client explained, "you have to have a laugh when you're working". It has already been noted that while the fundamental motivation of clients was to reduce their hours, the idea of simply turning up, performing a task and then leaving was regarded as 'boring' - the least desirable use of their mandated time. Clients wanted their time to be spent meaningfully, and one of the most readily investable meanings for them was to perceive work as a social activity. At the most basic level, 'banter' - the casual interaction between clients whilst working - made tasks meaningful because it created a positive gloss whereby the work was done in tandem with discussing developments in one another's lives, the latest sporting news, or bemoaning politicians and

the legal system. But when this positive gloss was laid across the sort of work discussed in the previous chapter as having the potential for deeper meaning, banter served as a catalyst. Socialisation hybridised clients' initial investment in the work - determination towards a goal, focus on meeting standards, a desire to contribute to a valuable effort - with the positive gloss that banter provided. As a result, banter became more than just a gloss; it led to camaraderie and increased coordination, creating spontaneous instances of collective problem-solving and mutual support in approaching challenges the task at hand presented. More than simply mechanical application of effort to their work, morale-driven clients approached it with creativity, determination and teamwork. As a result, their initial investments were not only realised - goals completed, standards met, contribution achieved - but they were enhanced by the collective effort the work had come to represent.

By contrast, certain clients proved resilient, even resistant, to this trajectory of morale development. They not only refused to recognise even a modicum of investment in a given task, but actively sought to undermine the efforts of their colleagues in positively nurturing that investment through teamwork. Rather than simply demonstrating fundamental graft in silence, such clients would actively challenge tasks in front of their colleagues: whilst constructing the archery range at Argyll Park, while the rest of the client team were checking the range's log bordering and admiring its finish, one such client waved his hands in the air whilst sneering, "woo, great job team!" (with a sarcastic inflection that suggested his cynicism towards both the quality of the job, and the idea of them as a team). What made this particular moment so curious, however, was that over the course of the day this particular client had been as engaged in the group banter as any other client; only at the conclusion did he demonstrate his challenge towards what the work represented. This would seem to suggest that while banter, and the developmental collective positivity it generated, was valuable in shaping client perceptions, it did not function without that initial investment of positive

perception.

The key interpersonal facets amongst clients who demonstrated morale, and the same facets that cynical clients mocked, were profoundly normative qualities that investment in the work promoted. While all tasks assigned as part of the unpaid work requirement possessed a distinct element of physical exertion, tasks such as facility construction or beautification efforts encouraged in clients a sense of focus, resilience and mutual support. Clients would frequently assess their collective progress, drawing (and often expressing to the rest of the group) personal encouragement from the achievements they had already made - an erected wall, or a section of constructed path - which in turn encouraged them to persist at the effort despite the physical demand. Where one client was struggling, others would temporarily set aside their section of the task to provide assistance; work was not a blinkered, individualised effort, but in many ways a microcosm of interaction in itself. Rather than a dynamic between clients and beneficiaries shaping the reality of unpaid work, morale allowed clients to collectively shape the task assigned to them: a group effort defined by mutual support and collective accomplishment. This, in turn, had positive effects on clients that transcended the temporal and spacial boundaries of the requirement, with clients going home experiencing a sense of pride, personal value and positive contribution.

When exploring the concept of morale, and its relation to the wider significance of unpaid work in its surrounding literature, it is interesting to examine the role of the client in the requirement's social reality. As observed here, the client is not some deficit-ridden individual in need of lifestyle stabilisation, work skills or, perhaps most patronisingly of all, the development of proper social skills; rather, they are complex normative beings obliged to carry out work, but nevertheless capable of engaging on a deeper level - of finding some degree of 'fulfilment' in the work [Morris, 1993]. But what is particularly interesting is the nature of this 'fulfilment': while client morale is tied to meaningful work, and attendant notions of positive,

constructive contribution, the development of a client-constituted reality did not place notions of reparation or integration as central defining facets. Work that was of benefit to others was not directly responded to in a positive way based on that sense of benefit [Young, 1979], but rather because it is a meaningful use of time; contribution and value to others were crucial external catalysts, but the rationale was far more internal than typical theory on unpaid work would credit. Client morale was not grounded in a desire to render symbolic apology, or achieve a public, symbolic transformation from societal drain to contributor [Duff, 2003]; it was grounded in a desire to perceive their Order-mandated time as being used productively. Clients were not altruists; if they had to work, they wanted their obliged time spent working to have some positive, valuable meaning according to their own perceptions. While this did serve as a gateway in numerous instances to concepts of generativity, such occurrences are typically the product of post-work reflection [Maruna, 2001].

During the height of summer, the staff at Montrose Park asked one of the client teams to which I was attached to help them in beautifying several areas of the park that were popular with visitors. While this ultimately involved basic tasks such as clearing away park supplies and an extensive amount of weeding, the client team responded positively to the wider idea that they were making their particular area of the park - a small square outside the cafe - a more pleasant experience for visitors. It was, they thought, a good use of their time. During breaks from the task at hand, particularly over lunch, the team was highly animated in their discussions with each other. From its starting point in expressing disbelief at the sheer heat of the day's weather, the conversation evolved into some clients recounting their weekend activities, whilst others bemoaned their current disagreements with the local council (typically over an issue with their housing). But even in these periods where the conversation focussed

on some hardship or grievance, the overall tone retained the same constructive spirit with which the clients had engaged their work; whenever one client aired their grievances, the others would provide personal support, either empathising with their own situation or offering some kind of advice from prior experience.

What was particularly interesting about the cohesion that team morale developed was that it wasn't limited to the task at hand. During breaks in the work for lunch, a few minutes of recovery or, most commonly, a cigarette break, clients in a morale-driven group would discuss their wider lives. These discussions typically centred around the same issues, challenges, events and even ambitions they discussed with their supervisors (even name-dropping and comparing their respective social workers on occasion), with the occasional interspersing of more mundane conversation topics - local gossip, or the results of the latest football match. But the spirit of the team's morale persisted; more than just coordination, their cohesion created a mutual sense of support. Clients would, at the very least, sympathise with one of their peers' struggle with the benefits department, or an ex-partner jealously denying visitation rights. Often, they would offer suggestions (quite useful ones, as it turned out for many clients), drawing on their own past experiences to recommend a reliable lawyer, point out an alternative means of navigating council bureaucracy, or simply offering personal advice in the spirit of helping one another out. These interactive moments were entirely absent the beneficiaries' involvement, but that did not diminish their significance in shaping the social reality of unpaid work: these were internal, private, highly personal discussions, and while they often possessed a raw emotive quality that clients didn't display to other stakeholders (anger, outright resentment, and sometimes even an impotent sadness at the insurmountability of their challenges), it nevertheless demonstrated that clients wanted to get their lives into a tentative state of order. While some offending behaviour - narcotics consumption and aspects of anti-social

behaviour - were disregarded, for the remainder clients did not want to cross the police, and expressed a desire for comfortable employment, a supportive family dynamic and minor disposable income to enjoy a few select luxuries. Although clients would often discuss their offending behaviour as an initial introduction with each other, typically linking it to the severity (i.e. the duration) of their unpaid work, those were not their defining facets with one another. The group dynamic, cultivated by the cohesion, coordination and mutual support of team morale, was more than just 'having a laugh', as one client put it. In many ways, it created a nascent form of community - in terms of a network of support, rather than any geographical construct - where unpaid work catalysed a collaborative, constructive, even aspirational atmosphere. Rather than unpaid work bringing clients together with beneficiaries and/or members of the public, its more common and profound ability was to bring clients together with one another, and morale's aspects of cooperation and collaboration expanded into a wider, social effort.

As a collaborative process amongst clients themselves, morale-driven work may be seen as fulfilling an integrative rationale. This would not follow classically conventional understandings of community service - ideas of symbolically demonstrating worth and redemption to the public through the medium of work in order to generate social capital [Bazemore and Boba, 2007] - but rather the act of unpaid work service as a locus for initial, tentative integration. Instead of this integration being predicated on clients' identity transformation (either their own self-identity or their perceived identity) through external interaction with other stakeholders [cf. Maruna, 2011], what has instead transformed are the interactive connectors between clients. Clients' contextual role has not changed, nor has their situation; indeed, it is the very nature of unpaid work clients as such that is required for such individuals to be brought together, their social bonds forged in the crucible of meaningful, investment-worthy work through cooperation and mutual support. These bonds ultimately parallel the pro-social relationships discussed in more typical community service theory: providing resilience

against criminogenic risks, mutual assistance towards positive goals, and both normative reinforcement and practical support for a gradual shift towards a non-offending lifestyle. Rather than find such networks of support in local geographies, or beneficiary organisations, the unpaid work requirement (whether deliberately or not) facilitated clients to find such networks in one another: a network founded in a mutuality of understanding, and working towards sustainable long-term change [Maxwell and Morris, 2001].

Far from needing to engineer identity change in clients through generativity [McNeill and Maruna, 2008] or ritualistic performance before audiences [Maruna, 2011], unpaid work's morale-driven groups simply offered a space in which it could not only be expressed, but nurtured through mutual and comparative experiences, as well as supported through practical advice. Utilising Worrall and Hoy's understanding of what constitutes a 'community' [2005] - homogeneity based on common social characteristics, and a mutual responsibility of support for and to its members (paralleled in Raynor [2001] as 'collective problem solving') - then what could be seen in CPO's unpaid work was a tentative, ad hoc creation of a community of support. Grounded in clients' perceptions of each other as victims of an unequal system, unpaid work acted not only as the locus in which they gathered to share information and advice, but a crucible that transformed this support from a purely practical move into a personally-driven commitment to one's colleagues. This could be argued to fulfil an ultimately integrative rationale - not any superficial integration to a local community, and going beyond even the integration of clients to a law-abiding lifestyle, but pursuing Marshall's aspirational vision [1999] of constructing a better society (in this case, one in which mutual client support sought to address, overcome or bypass institutional injustices that contribute to offending).

That being said, it would be overly generous to credit the unpaid work requirement with deliberately empowering clients to harness it as a space within which to enable and personalise their own change; when compared to,

for instance, Weaver's concept of co-produced justice [2011], the absence of deliberately decentralised decision-making and community-based local resources to support beneficial client outcomes indicates morale-driven cooperation as a happy coincidence of variable contextual factors, offering ad-hoc solutions to one another based on a random catalogue of experience.

Towards the end of my attachment to unpaid work, Argyll Park assigned a team of clients to clear up what they referred to as 'the wood pile'. The team was one with whom I'd developed a particularly strong dynamic: they were a reliably engaged group of clients, frequently entrusted with complex tasks that resulted in positive contributions to the beneficiaries (the archery range being their most accomplished example during my attachment). The wood pile, however, proved to be the exception to this rule: a glorified junkyard of rotten timber, piping, scrap sheet metal and other miscellaneous bric-a-brac. Within an hour of starting, two clients began slacking off, carrying only small bits and pieces of junk to the skip at a time. This, in turn, lowered the morale of the rest of the team - "why should I bust my ass if they've got their fingers up theirs?" as one rather brilliantly put it. Ultimately, as clients sniped at one another for lax participation or clumsy mistakes, the entire effort ground to a halt for an early lunch break.

There were, however, instances where even engaged and morale-driven client teams struggled to maintain that morale and their investment in the work. This was invariably caused by the conditions and circumstances of the work assigned to them. Morale required a hook; something in which to be invested. Work that lacked a substantive component with which to engage - a rationale or purpose that required and rewarded client investment, rather than thoughtless physical effort - was responded to either with such automation, as clients mechanically executed the task absent an activated

group dynamic, and all its consequent benefits. Or, as was more often the case, such work's demand upon clients was begrudged, and morale turned into demoralisation. The work's lack of a dimension beyond the need for mindless labour was recognised as such, and described as 'boring', 'pointless' or 'worthless'. Beneficiaries had a crucial part to play in such situations; or, rather, their lack of a part was a crucial contributing factor. For tasks such as the infamous 'wood pile', beneficiaries were responsible for brief, perfunctory assignments - typically reducible to 'we need this cleaned up' - with no clear justification or value. While in some situations, such as beautifying an area of parkland or building an archery range, the task had a morale hook implicit within it, but in other circumstances the beneficiaries served an essential role of sharing their perspectives with clients as to why the work needed to be done, and thus the value to and of the clients in so doing it.

However, even in such instances, morale was not a guaranteed constant. Potentially meaningful work - with a rationale and purpose in which clients could, and might even have, become invested - might still falter in situations where complications arose. Difficulties not anticipated or accepted as inherent to the work's completion, such as faulty equipment or unexpected circumstances, were met by proceeding iterations of frustration, anger, complaint and their resigned (and resentful) surrender. Client morale was a finite resource, existing in a cyclical relationship with the work, and requirement regular reinforcement through a sense of positive progress being made with the work. If client investment of time and effort did not yield sufficient dividends, then the sense of positivity and purpose upon which their morale was founded would begin to fracture, and the cycle would invert: further exertion of effort would be met with continued inertia, leading to an increased negative reaction and less effort. In such instances, rather than providing an abstract perspective, the beneficiary role was altogether more practical: providing pragmatic, tactile, problem-solving assistance to prevent clients' negative perceptions from becoming the defining trait of the task.

Such intervention was vital, as demoralisation was just as work-defining as team morale. As one or more clients grew increasingly frustrated, that frustration spread to others in the group: one person has already given up on trying to complete the task and begun to question its viability/validity, leading to others either beginning to question similarly, or simply why they should bother shouldering an even greater portion of the effort (for no improvement in progress) when someone else has given up trying. This demonstrated two critical facets about morale. Firstly, in defining the social reality of unpaid work as an ongoing activity, while beneficiaries had a part to play, the key dynamic was actually that which exists between individual clients to form group cohesion/collaboration or lack thereof. Secondly, however, that dynamic was actually underpinned at the most fundamental and essential level on the foundational notion of graft: that all clients contribute their share of basic, required effort to the task at hand. If all clients were pulling their weight equally, or at least to a minimum accepted standard, then positivity and support could flourish; but if one client was doing less than the others, and not meeting some minimum standard, then resentment was fostered, and far from supporting one another a process of cynicism and recrimination began.

Now, this is not to say that the beneficiary had no role in shaping the social reality of unpaid work as an ongoing activity. As already noted, both here and in the previous chapter, the initial framework of contextualising the value of the task at hand was crucial in providing the atmosphere in which morale could develop: investment required something in which to normatively invest, positivity required work about which clients were inclined to feel positive, and coordination/support required work of sufficient practical and abstract complexity to fuel it as a social process. In situations such as the 'wood pile', tasks where beneficiaries failed to explicate the importance or value of the task resulted not only in morale being thwarted, but inverted. With regards to this, ongoing contact between the two stakeholders throughout the working day, no matter how brief or seemingly perfunctory,

was often critical: beneficiaries were thus able to express a personal, positive reaction to any progress made, and reinforce the value of the task being done. While morale was ultimately an internal dynamic, it required external conditions for it to be fostered, and those were provided by beneficiaries. Additionally, on a more practical level, it was critical that beneficiaries check in frequently to ensure client teams hadn't encountered some unforeseen hindrance to their progress. With greater professional expertise, access to the full resources and tools of the work site, and the power to reassign clients to a more viable task, beneficiaries were the only stakeholder equipped to avoid the one determinant of unpaid work's social reality that was otherwise outwith either party's control: objective failure. Failure thwarted investment, accomplishment, pride, construction and cooperation; it vindicated frustration, isolation and bitterness towards other clients and even beneficiaries for setting one up to fail; it undermined the potential meanings of the work and the client as its worker. While providing appropriate tools, or reassigning clients to an achievable task when a passing inspection highlighted an insurmountable challenge, were not glamorous interactive moments for beneficiaries, they were essential in this regard, and the contextual circumstances of unpaid work rendered beneficiaries the only stakeholder with the power to do so.

The Mood Whilst Working - An External Canvas and Internal Community

It would be tempting to present the twin themes of graft and morale as somehow conflicting determinants of unpaid work's social reality. And while it is true to an extent that the latter is a product of clients harnessing unpaid work as their own locus, and the former occurs in the absence of such a harnessing, that does not place the two concepts in conflict. Not only did graft support morale-driven work in practical terms, but even in instances where clients tentatively constructed their own internal communities, the wider effects of graft still shaped unpaid work's social reality.

It is perhaps, in retrospect, uncharitable to entirely label graft as being perception-neutral from the client's perspective. The ideas of fair treatment and respect were subtle but foundational conditions clients imposed upon their interactions with beneficiaries, and the work they were assigned to do as a result. It was the negotiated exchange for beneficiaries' own conditions on their movement, behaviour and even attire, ensuring that the most basic facet of unpaid work - that is, the actual execution of tasks - was achieved in a compliant manner.

Thus it would be fairer to say that graft was the client's focussed commitment to completing the work in a compliant fashion, absent any concern for the wider scope or context of the work. Clients did not perceive their work as redemptive, rehabilitative, or even necessarily integrative - it was an obligation imposed upon them (quite fittingly, a 'requirement'), and thus had to be completed to a baseline acceptable standard in order to erase the entirely practical debt made manifest in their 'hours remaining'. It is, however, still fair to say that graft presents considerable conceptual challenges for unpaid work's integration into many common themes in community service literature. While it certainly indicates that more historic (and arguably outdated) concepts of 'discipline' and 'demand' as work virtues [Morris, 1993] are to be found in the eyes of beholders rather than the actors, more modern concepts also struggle. Ideas of moral communication [Duff, 2003; Pamment and Ellis, 2010], or the potential for unpaid work to build human and social capital [McNeill, 2009] equally struggle to find purchase on the sheer surface of graft's pragmatic drive towards completion.

But, to bridge graft and morale, it might be said that this challenge is not exclusive to the former, nor ultimately a product thereof. Rather, there is a deeper cause: the lack of external expression to any public stakeholder, and the consequently internalised motivation and symbolic dynamic. Theories of community service that espouse ideas of public symbolism and interaction (or at least demonstration) [Bazemore and Boba, 2007; Maruna, 2011] are equally challenged by this glimpse into the CPO, wherein clients, absent

such an audience, focus instead on worthwhile use of their own time, and the worth of work in terms of its resonance to their own values and interests. Narratives of reparation or redemption were instead replaced by the personal influence and impact of worthwhile, contributive work. Morale may have been generated by factors such as the public value of a work project, but only insofar as that public value enhanced the clients' self-perceptions as its realisers.

Morale was, as a result, not a contrast to graft, but an advancement of it; the idea of some perceptual hook catalysing an internal investment in the task at hand. The obligation remained, but a richer, more engaging set of perceptions were overlaid: a sense of contribution, a value to the work (and thus the client as its worker), the satisfaction of tangible progress towards a goal.

Morale generated internal meaning for clients' task. Positivity was transformed from a boredom-combatting gloss upon work to the medium by which clients both coordinated amongst themselves and self-nurtured their engagement. It did not erase the hard effort that the work required, but it also fostered experiences of reward, accomplishment and self-worth that graft - a determined but blinkered focus on completion - could not achieve. Indeed, morale carried with it the potential to transcend the work that bred it, offering a potential solution to the absence of conventional unpaid work narratives produced by clients' insularity. Instead of unpaid work facilitating both internal change and external support resources through generativity [McNeill and Maruna, 2008] or public performance [Maruna, 2011], similar results were achieved by clients forming networks amongst each other. Not only does this evoke the same theoretical definition of 'community' but in a radically different context - a group united by shared characteristics, held together by mutual collective support [Raynor, 2001; Worrall and Hoy, 2005] - but the underlying values (and potential benefits) of shared understanding, respect and change effort are likewise paralleled [Maxwell and Morris, 2001].

It is, however, essential to emphasise that these tentative, novel

'communities' were neither a deliberate feature of unpaid work, nor were they guaranteed. Their spontaneous emergence was heavily reliant upon the contextual factors that helped to breed morale amongst clients, and their endurance was reliant upon clients sustaining that same morale. However, much in the same way beneficiaries overlooked the issue of client graft with expressions of appreciation for hard work and commitment, they likewise did not realise the full importance of their regular check-ins to address any practical obstacles to work projects. Such check-ins, to them, were simply a pragmatic means of ensuring projects were completed with minimal disruption; there was no realisation that the social ethos of a tentative, problem-solving, communally-assisting collective relied upon such a fragile sense of positivity and engagement.

Chapter 10 - The Results of the Work

Unpaid work is arguably a unique phenomenon amongst the penal disposals available to the criminal justice system, both within the range of requirements available under the CPO but also across the more general spectrum of sanctioning. Unlike sanctions that return an offender to their state pre-offending, or those which seek to support the offender in achieving a law-abiding lifestyle, unpaid work's ultimate goal is not one of neutrality. At the completion of unpaid work, an offender client has put physical effort into one or more projects and changed the local context of the work site as a result. More than a neutral 'reset', unpaid work involves results that can contribute to the landscape of their environment.

Unsurprisingly, this phenomenon can have a profound effect upon the client. While it has already been noted that not all work conducted is meaningful, even the moment of completion for a laborious, tedious odd-job can provide beneficiaries an opportunity to alter client perceptions on reflection, creating if not a deep, personal meaning for the work then at least some relevance and sense of worthwhile use of time. But it is in meaningful work, into which clients have invested some personal stake, that the moment of completion, and the consequent witnessing of the work's results, that define the tentative process of change visible in the most positive examples of unpaid work within the CPO. Not only does it provide an interactive moment for clients and beneficiaries to meet and create a shared sense of worth in both the project and the clients as those who realised it, but in many ways it empowers the client: their ownership over the work endows them with a symbolically interpretive authority, which actually invokes the hitherto uninvolved public as a source of positive self-perception.

Part 1 - Beneficiary Feedback and Client Fulfilment

In the previous chapter, a key distinction was drawn in unpaid work

between clients who approached the work in an automated manner - focussed and competent, yet ultimately unengaged, labour with the sole intention of reducing one's allotted hours - and clients who invested some personal, normative stake in suitable work, and whose desire to spend their allotted hours meaningfully in turn generated meaning for the work undertaken. However, any investment eventually requires some form of payoff, and while the idea of normative and symbolic dividends have been touched on in the concept of client 'fulfilment' (the achievement of work to which the client has become normatively engaged), this phenomenon requires a greater focus in order to understand its full impact upon the social reality of unpaid work; how a task is completed, and the consequent interactions, are essential in defining what the entire process meant.

The client team had just completed laying down chicken wire on a series of wooden stairs at Montrose Park (discussed in the previous chapter). While the clients were sore from kneeling and hammering for several hours, as they cleared up their tools and prepared to leave the site, several of them took in a full view of the newly-covered stairs. "You know, that doesn't look too bad," one commented, sparking a discussion about how the stairs had previously gotten slippery in the rain. As the van drove them back to the social work centre, amidst other comments about sore joints, other clients agreed that they would have considered the prior steps to have been a health and safety risk too, and that it was "a good thing" that the park had set someone to fixing them.

The completion of a task was a moment of reflection for clients; to look back upon an assignment, the effort they had put in, and the results of their labour. In all cases, clients derived some sense of meaning from their work - even menial odd-jobs which they had performed in a mindless fashion were, at least, time they could score off their remaining hours. But reflection was

different from prospection, and the dynamic between clients and beneficiaries was interesting at this concluding (and conclusive) moment: whereas opening, framing explanations by beneficiaries may not have achieved an initial investment amongst clients, expressions of gratitude, value and positive impact were sometimes able to tap into something latent within client perceptions. Although never as profound as tasks where clients had experienced some normative engagement from the starting point, even tasks that were perceived in the doing as dull, menial and automated could be elevated by their benefit. Argyll and Montrose Park were both perceived as 'good' organisations by clients, translated as a perception of them as worthy of carrying out unpaid work for, and that wider, contextual 'goodness' was able to translate some odd-jobs by proxy - while the task was still unengaging, that did not necessarily make it meaningless. The consequent contribution to the organisation transferred some of the organisation's worthiness back onto the task via the beneficiaries' expressions of gratitude (and, more importantly, value and positive impact). While the task may not have fulfilled some initial client investment, they nevertheless came away satisfied with the use of their time. That can, in turn, be contrasted with other odd-jobs, where no sense of value or positive impact was transferred back onto the task (two particularly notable, and client-objected, examples were clearing up a storehouse at Argyll Park, and washing dishes in Montrose Park's cafe). Such work lacked the necessary contribution and/or benefit to the organisations for an exchange of worthiness, and so were considered unsatisfying (i.e. 'a waste of time').

It is interesting, and important, to once again note that, even at the conclusion of the more undesirable category of unpaid work, there was still an absence of punitive significance - neither stakeholder perceived any notion of penal hardship or difficulty inherent to odd-jobs. While individual tasks may have considerable physical demand, that is not considered a defining facet upon reflection, and certainly is not tied into any wider contextual repertoire of either punitive suffering or even moral

confrontation/penance [Rex, 2002; Worrall and Hoy, 2005; Pamment and Ellis, 2010].

This presents a challenge, since much of the reparative rationale concerning unpaid work is grounded in the symbolic notion of the client undoing the damage of their offence, both to society and their own standing [McIvor, 1992; Maxwell and Morris, 2001; Weaver and Armstrong, 2011]. Even more redemptive notions of client transformation do not fit neatly with the changes observed here; while clients did 'change', the wider implication of that change being somehow 'redemptive' was absent [Maruna and King, 2008]. Integrative rationales likewise impose a consequent significance of 'making amends', requiring some client self-perception of fault and symbolic apology as a result [Von Hirsch, Ashworth and Shearing, 2003], or exploring the causes and consequences of offending [Shapland et al., 2006]. Clients grow in self-perception, but not from wrong-doer into positive contributor; rather, their new status as positive contributor elevates facets of confidence, self-worth and positive potential. In this sense, the dynamic of unpaid work's transformative results actually sits closer to the 'redemption script' of desistance, emphasising not the offender's wrongdoing but the normative facets of their criminogenesis [Maruna, 2001; McNeill, 2004]. Although unpaid work fails to address the social inequalities that contribute to offending behaviour, the idea of 'belief' as a powerful transformative force (for self-growth, rather than any idea of redemption) and the value of contribution are both reflected significantly in the work observed. The most interesting difference, however, is that whereas belief is normally considered to be an external force, here it is profoundly internal.

Moments of reflection at the conclusion of unpaid work, however, were capable of achieving more than the prevention of negative perceptions. Where clients were already normatively invested in the work, wherein they had invested perceptions of worth/value (both personal and concerning the task), contribution and committed effort into the work, the moment of completing the work also became a critical moment in completing this

developmental process. Finishing the task, stepping back and regarding the finished product was an opportunity to reflect upon the exertion of (invariably) considerable effort, motivated by more than obligation and a fundamental desire to reduce one's hours, but a sincere desire to do a good job. Seeing that good job achieved and made tangible was more than satisfying, more than a good use of a client's time; it was to some extent transformative.

After over a month of observed work (and considerably more time prior to my arrival), the archery range at Argyll Park was completed. With the exception of the actual targets at the far end of the range, the entire work site was the product of client labour: the wood bordering, the waterproof underlayer, the woodchip surface, the steps leading to it from the park's main pathway. With the exception of several days, this project had been the undertaking of a single weekly group, and after laying the final log to complete the bordering they stepped back to survey their work. "That's fucking gorgeous," one commented in a moment of forgetfulness regarding the site's behavioural rules on swearing. They discussed how the waterproof underlayer would make it usable even when the summer weather gave way to rain in the autumn and how the bordering gave it a 'real natural' look. They walked up and down the approaching steps to see how it would appear to members of the public seeing it for the first time. One client even commented, quite sincerely, on how he'd like to have a shot on the range himself (although he did ask a beneficiary later, I was never able to find out if he did get one).

Such a reflection could not be engineered post-facto; it was the product of investment, the dividend payoff multiple weeks and tens of work hours in the making. But the clients weren't discussing the range as a representation of the sum total reduction of their remaining hours, or even of it as a worthwhile use of their time. Their repertoire was infinitely more

personal, rooted in a sense of pride, achievement, even wonder at what they had created. But what was most fascinating was how the clients incorporated, and made not only relevant but profound, the context in which their work existed: not the product of a punitive mandate, but a contribution. Something others would use and enjoy, and that would enhance the park as a whole.

Interactively speaking, the beneficiaries had a crucial role to play in amplifying and reinforcing this client perception. Beneficiary feedback reinforced the worth and contribution clients felt, with sincere expressions of gratitude, amazement, happiness and professional approval. But more than a purely personal response, beneficiaries served to strengthen the contextual value of the work through their repertoire, with their feedback frequently invoking the public in the form of visitors, and the positive impact that the clients' efforts would have upon their experience of the park. Clients appreciated personal gratitude, but the deeper consequence of improving the park and the time spent there by visitors solidified their sense of contribution. While praise undoubtedly improved their self-perception, the assurance that through their work they themselves were valuable, meaningful and positive was of far greater impact. Their own self-perceptions, already having undergone tentative alteration through the work, were vindicated; someone else had confirmed them as productive and contributive, reinforcing a growing belief in a better conceptualisation of their selves.

During one day of unpaid work, where particularly heavy summer rain forced numerous client teams to gather at the Council-run workshop and conduct some impromptu cleaning of its facilities, I got talking to one of the workshop's overseers. In our discussions, and between helping the clients with transporting massive planks of lumber, we moved onto the topic of what the workshop actually produces. Mostly benches and tables, the overseer replied - their simplicity allows for clients to develop introductory woodworking and joinery skills, and there's

a clear use to them. The overseer also explained that one of the challenges of the workshop was that, while clients can spend a considerable amount of time and effort on a single project, once it's completed it just vanishes. Unlike on-site construction work, clients don't have any guarantee of seeing their work in use. This is why, whenever the unpaid work staff receive feedback from the schools or nursing homes to which the benches are usually sent, they frequently ask for letters or photographs which they can share with the clients responsible, to show them (at least remotely) the positive impact their work has had.

The challenge with such an interaction is that this complex, highly abstract moment of value and worth requires grounding - as will be seen in the subsequent part of this chapter, it requires a symbolic object into which this meaning can be imbued. Meaningful work such as the archery range or the construction of benches and tables can be contrasted with less clearly defined odd-jobs, such as clearing up storage space in one of the parks. While such odd-jobs do make a positive impact, the benefit - typically saving time for the beneficiaries or improving convenience for some other project - lacks a concrete quality that both grounds the value and amplifies its worth (and by extension, that of the clients). Clients were aware that cleaning jobs made a useful contribution to beneficiaries, but derived no personal payoff from their efforts - neither the work, nor its symbolic content, was sufficient for normative engagement, or the payoff for that investment.

While the symbolic element is worth discussing as its own concept in the second part of this chapter, the specific nature of unpaid work has been a recurring theme for client perceptions. In this final discussion, the results of meaningful work were heavily tied to tangibility: clients found tasks with which members of the public could physically engage - to either passively observe, or better yet physically interact - to provide the strongest normative feedback. Tangibility provided a clear metric of value and impact, as clients could not

only see their effort entrenched somewhere within the physical context of the work site, but the capacity to watch members of the public make use of their work was a physical language rich in meanings of worth and positivity. To see school children sat around a bench clients had built, or visitors make use of the archery range (and one client even wishing to so engage with it himself) all spoke of a clear relevancy link, whereby clients harnessed the presence and use of the work's physical phenomenon to validate its normative weight.

One of the ongoing projects at Argyll Park was clearing out an area of wilderness to serve as fresh parkland. Towards the end of a working day where a client team was engaged in this project, one of the beneficiaries was leading a group of clients through the park. The group passed the client team as they were clearing up the site, and while the beneficiary explained in brief the parkland they envisioned growing once it was cleared out, there wasn't a single acknowledge of the clients' mere presence, let alone their contribution to this envisaged project. Once the group moved on, the clients expressed disbelief, and more than a little anger, at the way they had been treated - more than mere offence, there was a feeling that some unspoken agreement had been broken. While the clients recognised, from a practical viewpoint, that the beneficiary could not identify them as an unpaid work team, any lack of recognition at all for their work deeply soured a day that had otherwise been highly positive in terms of both work progress, and clients' self-perceptions in relation thereto.

Of equal importance to the tangibility of the work was the sincerity of beneficiaries' reactions. Although rare, there were instances where beneficiaries' reactions of gratitude were expressed more as a perfunctory, ritualistic response, rather than an actual, personally-driven recognition of the work's value; sometimes, as an utmost rarity, no reaction was expressed at all. Such instances, far from returning the work to some neutral state, actually had the potential to undermine its result. At least with odd-jobs, clients left the

automated work content that their hours had been commensurately reduced; but where clients engaged with meaningful work, unresponsive beneficiaries could sour that investment. In opposition to the collectivity generated by informal beneficiary/client interactions, if feedback for tasks was perceived to be perfunctory, the clients risked perceiving the situation as 'othering' - separating them from the beneficiaries, the context of the site, and even their very work as distinct, and subtly inferior, stakeholders. The implied sense was that clients were there to do the work, and its completion was simply the fulfilment of an obligation rather than a contribution to be valued. This stripped even their own work from them: no longer did they have ownership over it as a positive effort, enhancing their own sense of self in the process; the work was a mandate taken from their efforts and held by those benefitting from it. Thus the lack of any socially symbolic reciprocation only served to reinforce the fundamental context of unpaid work as a punishment - a truth more constructive interactions were able to overwrite - and thus tasks became perceived as a form of exploitation. Clients described such situations as feeling as though they were being kept 'at arms length'; their involvement was simply a practical, pragmatic provision of effort, rather than a meaningful contribution.

By contrast, when beneficiaries did express a sincere response to clients' work, it generated the antithesis of 'othering' - a sense of belonging. Through clients' contribution, and beneficiaries' response thereto, a social link was established between the two stakeholders that created a mutual perception of membership. Because their work was a part of the site, clients became a part of it too, and thus shared (at least in that regard) an equal position with the staff. Such membership had the additional perk that all the positive facets of the site - the perceptions of the good work it did and the positive response public visitors had to it - became personally relevant to clients. By taking part in the organisation's efforts, they became a part of it. The limitation to this shared reality was that unpaid work largely failed to monopolise upon this body: it was typically a passing sensation, finite to the

length of a client's requirement and contingent upon their personal interaction with beneficiaries. Only in rare instances did such a membership actually lead to an ongoing, post-requirement relationship between client and beneficiaries, denying the former a source of support and assistance, and the latter a valuable, motivated contributor to the site.

On the surface, this dynamic between clients and beneficiaries at the conclusion of an unpaid work task appears to have little application to either a reparative or integrative rationale. The social reality appears to be an altogether narrower and more personal experience, rooted in the personal growth of the client through the realisation and performative demonstration of their positive potential [Frayne, 1993], with external social forces acting as a force multiplier to this effect. However, it is interesting to note the ways in which the process and result of unpaid work harnesses these external social forces, and makes them relevant to clients.

On the one hand, the notion of unpaid work as a public performance of 'atonement' [Raynor, 2001] does not find purchase in the CPO teams observed in this research, and given the terminology applied to the literature it is questionable whether such a rationale is truly 'integrative' or, lacking a social capital element, merely reparative. Nevertheless, the idea of a public element being engaged by the offender's positive act of contribution is relevant as the inverse can be seen here in unpaid work. While, yes, the experience of completing unpaid work is a personal one, much of its affective dimension is gained from this reparative rationale; clients feel they have done good because of the work's benefit to others, and thereby enhance their own self-perception. By this understanding, reparation is not merely some selling point of the CPO to a public believed to favour a more punitive response by default, but actually a critical factor in engaging and transforming client norms and self-perception. This is reflected in, for instance, the participant responses in Weaver and Armstrong's research [2011], where the idea of positive contribution emerges as a much stronger theme when compared to themes of atonement or apology. The act of 'putting something back into the

community... made them feel good about themselves' [p12], but without the wider performative dimension of 'repay[ing] your debt to society'. Rather, it might be said that in utilising and engaging with the results of clients' work, it was actually the public that was symbolically performing (however unwittingly) for the clients' benefit. In this sense, a 'reparative' rationale may be something of a misnomer, as the concept of 'repair' - the implication that the client is undoing a harm, with attendant notions of being held to account for said harm (i.e. criminal wrongdoing) [McIvor, 2004] - is not entirely accurate. While the rationale at work here shares many of the same elements, this crucial reframing would instead suggest a 'contributive' rationale.

But of even greater importance to clients' self-perceptions, and the resultant influence on unpaid work's social reality, is the symbolic process of 'achievement'. Morris [1993] touched upon this idea decades ago, discussing the importance of unpaid work being 'personally fulfilling' for clients, providing an opportunity for positive and constructive activities. Rather than unpaid work serving as a symbolic performance to other stakeholders as an audience, but to themselves. The completion of a meaningful task and the production of a physical artefact is the culmination of the long, tentative process discussed in the previous chapters, with clients' sense of achievement acting as the capstone to a developed, deepened engagement with the work, and a corresponding discovery of the self. It is no coincidence that the sense of achievement is tied to the very factors that transformatively impact client self-perception - fulfilment, positivity, constructive contribution. Clients engaged in such work have been performing to themselves, simultaneously demonstrating and realising their own potential, which reaches its culmination and confirmation in the completed result of their work. Although it only becomes fully apparent to clients in retrospect, unpaid work has supported them in authoring their own 'self-narrative' [Cross, 2017].

Complementary to this is the explicit response of the beneficiaries, which neatly parallels the 'reciprocal relationships' discussed in McIvor's

research [1998]. The completion of unpaid work serves as a symbolic moment where the beneficiaries' response is just as meaningful and important as the clients' work; it is an opportunity to demonstrate trust, confidence and (perhaps most significantly in the CPO interactions observed as part of this research) appreciation. While it may not be accurate to say that in the CPO offenders 'gained' these qualities from the beneficiaries - implying beneficiaries did not trust, have confidence in, or appreciate clients beforehand - within the context of the clients' self-development, such expressions served as a reinforcing validation of their new, positive qualities.

However, it is vital to emphasise that this reinforcement and validation is strictly internal, and that this experience of unpaid work might as a result be rightly critiqued for its lack of development in terms of human capital: while clients have achieved through their work a typical combination of basic construction skills and coordinated team-working, the treatment of the task's completion as the culmination of unpaid work prevents this from being used as a staging point for further integrative collaboration [Bazemore and Boba, 2007]. While the nature of social connections is discussed in greater detail below, on a much more practical level the CPO fails to harness the powerful intersection of a nascent skill-set, and a vindicated normative motivation, through any formalised means of further volunteering or even employment possibilities. This could neatly complement the wider desistance notion of generativity, were it not for an absence of organisational support in explicitly harnessing clients' normative states towards long term social commitments in their wider lives [McNeill and Maruna, 2008]; while some clients discussed an increased motivation towards securing work (and by extension, providing for their families) as a result of unpaid work, such expressions were entirely the product of individual self-encouragement, and lacked practical support in the form of beneficiary collaboration. What this would suggest is that while unpaid work can, under the right conditions, act as an initial catalyst in the desistance process, and may even provide some basic human capital in the form of fundamental construction skills, achieving a viable entrenchment of

clients' improved self-perceptions requires greater follow-through on the part of other stakeholders within the unpaid work context. Perhaps ironically, given the prevailing themes of individualism in this discussion of unpaid work's social reality, the solution is in fact greater and more explicit linkages with the public, or at least beneficiaries. Taking a leaf from restorative justice, and especially their typical outcomes, a focus on supporting the client in moving away from offending (i.e. restoring the client not only to their pre-offending state, but from their criminogenesis altogether) [Shapland et al., 2006] could serve as a bridge between individualised self-development and wider social needs, without miring the stakeholders in a construction of the client and their work as a symbolic debt or apology. As noted in previous chapters, any ongoing relation between engaged clients and willing beneficiaries is the product of random social alignment; the profound and powerful experience of clients at the completion of a meaningful task thus risks being a temporary state.

Part 2 - Work as a Symbolic Product

While interaction between clients and beneficiaries helped to shape the social reality of unpaid work at the conclusion of individual tasks, it is notable that these interactions served more as a reinforcement of perceptual themes already present in clients' perspectives, rather than determinants of novel concepts. Through the process of labour, and the consequences of completion, the work itself had developed into symbolic product, suffused with the client's normative investment and the contextual value of beneficiaries. Thus, in endeavouring to understand the full meaning of unpaid work in practice, it is necessary to examine what the practical work means.

In order for a particular project to result in work that possessed symbolic value to the client, it had to fulfil several distinct criteria. As already noted, odd-jobs obviously could not give rise to a symbolic project; even in instances where clearing detritus and weeds from a path produced a visible

consequence for clients' efforts, there was no sense of permanency to such a result - weeds would regrow, paths would become dirty once again, and thus the clients' achievement was temporary. By contrast, 'good' or 'proper' work - that which produced a meaningful result - was not only visible and tangible, but possessed a longevity that allowed it to serve as a symbolic anchor. Something definite not only in spatial terms, but temporal terms also. A cleaned path would grow dirty, and thus the work done by clients (along with any sense of achievement, contribution or value) would be undone, but even if a constructed path grew dirty, that did not diminish the achievement of clients having constructed it themselves. Indeed, the dirtying of the path became a sign of usage, and thus a reinforcement of its worth.

Any task ultimately served as a mnemonic trigger for the act of working; clients could reminisce about past odd-jobs, such as when one of their number almost fell into a brook whilst attempting to clear it of logs and leaves. In retrospect, tasks could be remembered as 'a bit of a laugh' or 'a real tough job'. But only something clients had constructed or refurbished had the permanency, both physically and in terms of longevity, to generate its own meaning, rather than simply associations with the act of working.

Due to availability of spaces in the vans, I was assigned for one day to a more remote parkland another client team was undertaking as an ongoing project. Further from the city, this park was not only larger, but incorporated a wild forest into its features; to take advantage of this, the client team had been working for several weeks on constructing a cycle path through the forest. This included the obvious necessities - clearing brush, relocating larger plants, planning the path around immovable trees and other features - but the clients' imaginations were captured by the idea of a cycle path. Their discussions weren't just about how to practically coordinate the removal of obstacles; they surveyed the landscape, the lay of the land, and discussed what path through it all would make for the best experience. "Go right at that

tree, and they can cycle past the wee pond," or "that hill'd make for a great dip" were two observations made by clients during my day with the team and, having secured beneficiary approval, the path took shape in line with their vision, and at the end of the day the clients surveyed that vision made real.

In Chapter Ten, the idea of 'good work, well done' was discussed: how a task could generate focus and purpose for clients by providing a more complex relationship than effort in/results out. The idea of a variable, analogue scale of quality was an invitation for clients to do a better job than mere completion, and the results made any such increased effort manifest in a better end product. This, in turn, generated an increased sense of accomplishment: clients recognised when they had placed significant effort into making a project better than it needed to be, and that effort had paid off with an improved result. On the one hand, this served to reinforce the relation between work and worker, and the client's sense of pride and self-value at their increased effort yielding a high quality result. But there was also a uniquely personal stake: in rising above what was merely required for the task, the improved margin of quality was unique to the clients, providing their own touch beyond the project's necessities. Even if it was a small detail, like the deeper shade of blue that came from a few extra coats of paint on a park bench, that touch was not an inherent facet of the project, but a symbol of both the client's added contribution, but more fundamentally their presence. Quality allowed for a personalised, secret signature.

This understanding of work as a symbolic product, and the role of said product within the co-production of unpaid work's social reality, presents a unique challenge. As already touched upon in the previous section of this chapter, although not strictly operating according to a reparative rationale, there are distinct similarities from which the symbolic product draws its meaning from clients. Oldfield describes it best [1993, p32]:

"Self-improvement through the completion of worthwhile tasks for those whose lives have been marked by an absence of being valued and a lack of opportunity to contribute positively to their communities."

However, even Oldfield recognises this as distinct from reparation - the repayment of a debt owed to society that expiates the client from their wrongdoing. The symbolism here is for the client's own benefit, not for the public's (or even the beneficiary's, as they would seem to serve as a reinforcement for the client's own developmental progress). The repertoire of the work is not one that evokes the client's conversion from drain on societal resources to 'useful contributor to its general welfare' [Young, 1979]; while the sense of contribution is critical, the flow of meaning is inverted, so that the public is expressing something to the client, rather than vice versa.

On the one hand, this inversion potentially avoids the troubling input of retributive notions such as 'atonement' or 'annulment'; but in stripping unpaid work of its reparative concept of 'making amends', it is possible that the wider collaborative process of integration, and the forging of social linkages, may too have been removed. Both the integrative rationale and the collaborative process are predicated on the meanings that can be produced as a result of the unpaid work. The former advocates an aspirational, forward-looking purpose to the unpaid work, whereby the interaction between offender and local community members generates long-lasting social bonds between the two; a network of support in the offender's ongoing desistance process, based on the mutual perception of the offender as a positive contributor to society [McIvor, 1998; Marshall, 1999; Robinson and Shapland, 2008]. The latter realises this through the significance of the unpaid work: where said work demonstrates the offender's positive potential, fostering confidence between the two stakeholders, the community is given the opportunity to move past a punitive reaction, express their appreciation to the offender, and work with them to realise their integration through ongoing, supportive intervention [Young, 1979; Brownlee, 1998; McIvor, 1998; Bazemore and

Boba, 2007; Bottoms, 2008]. In this sense, then, the unpaid work's significance is not only a catalyst to initiate this interaction, but the initial forum in which it takes place – more than just a material contribution to the local area, it acts as a turning point in the social fabric wherein the offender can begin to form new self-perceptions, new associations with those he encounters in the process of his work, and a new status with them [Raynor, 2001]. But without the explicit, conscious involvement of the public, especially on a scale that is local and relevant to the client(s) in question, and an element of the work's symbolic repertoire committed to the external value of their contribution (rather than simply their own improved self-perception), this process is unachievable. Community members cannot envisage or validate clients' worth or dignity if they are not aware of their existence - certainly, there can be no conscious, collaborative effort on the part of local groups to incorporate clients into new relationships as a result of the work [Fox, 2016]. This is unfortunate, since as has already been seen unpaid work's results are heavily centred around client notions of contribution and a consequent change in clients' self-narratives, but without public perception of the work civic engagement cannot be achieved. The client may realise a new self through unpaid work, but there is no one to whom they can demonstrate it and entrench it in a new, pro-social relationship [Bazemore and Boba, 2007].

Moving beyond the clients' individual relationship with the results of their work, the tangibility of said work also allowed for a further important dimension to its symbolism: its physical relation to its wider context. The results of the clients' effort, whether a painted bench, an archery range or a cycle path, did not exist in abstract, but were situated within a location and amidst those who frequented it.

At the end of a work shift at Argyll Park, just towards the end of the archery range coming together, I was walking back to the van with several clients. The mood was positive and, as we walked past the park's playground, the sound of children laughing drew one of the

clients' attention. She lead me over to the playground and pointed to a metal slide dug into the side of a hill, which several of the children were lined up to use. "See that? I helped build that," she said with pride, before going on to explain how she'd done so. From the way she described it, the task itself seemed relatively simple: the slide itself was prefabricated, and so the bulk of the task had been digging out the hillside and securing the slide into it. But it wasn't the effort that made the client beam; it was watching the result of her work in use.

When reduced down to its basic components, any of the meaningful tasks discussed in these chapters were ultimately simple: the archery range was a length of levelled earth, spread with wood-chippings and lined with logs. Visually, the end result was undoubtedly impressive, but what really transformed the word into something symbolically greater than the sum of its parts was its sense of place. Not only the transformation of previously unused parkland, but the resultant use - that someone else, external to the clients, took some pleasure or benefit from it. That sense of place, the physical contextualisation of the work, generated the sense of contribution so frequently referred to in this discussion of unpaid work's social reality. In this sense, 'beneficiary' becomes a difficult word, since by the clients' perception all members of the public who encountered their work became beneficiaries of it; their lives were improved somehow by the work, thereby confirming the positivity of said work and, by extension, the client for realising it.

In addition, the physicality of the work and its corresponding sense of place within the site fulfilled a much more simple, but personally powerful significance as a symbolic product. On one level, clients could point to it, and identify it as theirs. "I helped with that", or "that's one of my tables", or "I worked on that last summer" were common expressions clients made to me as we moved around sites. But their identifiable ownership was in service to a deeper meaning: these results were theirs because of an act of construction, or of such significant repair as to constitute the same -

reminiscent of Theseus' ship, such extensive repairs rendered the object new and theirs. In identifying their work, they also identified the effort and value, and corresponding self-worth and personal pride, that making something represented. Clients talked, admittedly far less frequently, about more abstract but still 'good' work they had done - the 'charity shop run' that occasionally served as a default project when no sites had pressing requirements was one such instance. Clients knew their work of helping such shops clear out space for new stock and cycle inventory between sites was worthwhile - helping out a good cause - but it lacked the resonance of their own artefact. Ultimately, the entire process of unpaid work as an ideal phenomenon discussed in these chapters crystallised in the physical result, serving as a permanent monument to reinforce its meaning, and by consequence the client's altered self-perception.

Indeed, this crystallisation as process independent of beneficiaries was sometimes able to salvage instances mentioned in the previous section of this chapter: where beneficiary feedback with clients was a perfunctory expression of gratitude, arising from social obligation rather than an engaged response to the work. A stand-alone symbolic product, invested with the clients' own internal meaning, and serving as a bridging point directly to an appreciative public (however unwittingly), could become a surrogate to clients. Rather than beneficiaries' gratitude encouraging a perceptual growth amongst clients, the work's product could not only allow public enjoyment to provide indirect praise and gratitude, but often nurtured a much more resilient normative development. Clients were able to recognise the work as worthy of praise, and possessing its own intrinsic value as a contribution even if not recognised as such, and so elevate their opinions of themselves on their own as the workers who had achieved this result. No one at Argyll Park ever surveyed the archery range with the clients present, never expressed a sense of amazement or impression at what they had achieved; nevertheless, the clients valued the work on its own merits, and left it feeling personally better for having worked upon it.

Over the course of a fortnight, at least three different unpaid work teams laboured to help clear a field in Montrose Park of cuttings and natural waste - the product of a belated spring trim. Between the sheer density of the waste, the cumbersome nature of its transportation, the relatively small size of the team's van, and the distance between Montrose Park and the city dump, no single team was able to accomplish much more than clearing out a small patch of the field. Nevertheless, when the fortnight of clearing was over, each team that came back to Montrose Park surveyed the field with a sense of accomplishment, feeling that they had at least contributed a portion of appreciable effort, and equally appreciable results, to the task.

It is crucial to clarify at this point that clients did not need to be involved in the totality of a project from beginning to end in order to view its completed status as their symbolic product. So long as some distinct component of the product was identifiable as a result of their effort, whether in physical or temporal terms, then the client could form some bond with the work, and reap its normative dividends.

If there is one limitation when it comes to the symbolic product of unpaid work, it is that such products were only symbolic to the clients. While projects could, and often did, carry meaning with beneficiaries in terms of positive contribution and valued benefit (which did create a positive feedback loop for clients' self-perceptions), much of this association is reducible to the contribution of any on-site worker (unpaid or otherwise). When I was being taken around work sites by client teams' supervisors, they would frequently highlight what parts of the site had been built or renovated by clients. The extent of their contribution in some instances seemed considerable, but any sort of indication that these facilities or features had been constructed by individuals serving a CPO (or however one would care to 'market' such work products) was completely absent. While considerable detail has been given

to the client's internal dynamics in this chapter, the result is nevertheless one in which the beneficiaries' contextual power over both the work site and the arrangement of unpaid work therein allows their perception to dominate the shared social reality. Although far from malicious, the perception of clients as just another feature of the workforce (with several added conditions to their oversight) erases their special presence and contribution to said site - it is merely more work; a thing to be expected from staff, rather than celebrated openly as an achievement and contribution. It is telling that, in retrospect, so much of the client's perception of the results of their work does not rely on any public announcement or proclamation thereof; that, by comparison, they are capable of nurturing their sense of value from indirect, implicit scraps, as contrasted against an open, public symbol for everyone to perceive.

What is most unfortunate is that greater interactive contact, both with beneficiaries and potentially members of the public, would not be inimical to the internal development achieved in the CPO; take for instance Mclvor's foundational research [1992], in which clients not only provided work of clear, direct value to individual beneficiaries that developed a profound level of contact between the two, but that same contact generated a similar client perception of the work as a worthwhile endeavour. In later works [1998, 2010], Mclvor describes the reintegrative potential of such experiences as being grounded in reciprocal relationships, wherein clients have the opportunity to demonstrate (and, in turn, gain) the trust and confidence of others. This has a strong similarity with Maruna's theory of ritualised re-entry [2011]: although the work itself may not explicitly represent 'atonement' or 'reconciliation' for either stakeholder, the focus on creating a shared reality through performance (in this case, unpaid work establishing the client as the provider of worthwhile good to someone) alters the performer's status in both sets of perceptions. This need not be an entire 'community' (defined as some geographic locality); a group of individuals with the capacity to provide ongoing social support to the client's new status, and/or potential practical support would suffice. Such rituals, however, are noted by Maruna as

requiring a conscious audience; they cannot take place in secret, as the CPO primarily operates, effectively removing the public from any role other than an implicit foil for the client.

By contrast to this individualist approach, it could be argued, the CPO semi-privatises the role of the beneficiary, raising it above the level of local individuals to that of an abstract organisation. Drawing on research by Armstrong and Weaver [2011], this reciprocity-through-help is reliant on, if not a one-to-one relationship, then at least a client sense of providing support to the needy. Individuals in unpaid work, however, served as middle-management, providing assignments and (emphatically, still meaningful and sincere) feedback. As a result, the perception of rendering some good to those in need was diminished - the need was organisational, and the good was convenient services - and the mutuality/reciprocation that forges a shared reality could not be realised. The relationship was hierarchical, however hard beneficiaries strove through their behaviour to make it appear otherwise, and so that sense of demonstrating positive qualities through 'doing good' was diluted. Further, such a contextual significance removed the interactive impetus for beneficiaries to continue supporting clients' status post-work, because the work was understood as quasi-transactional, rather than the provision of help to one in need. Indeed, this may be why clients observed in this study looked to the response of public visitors to their work as a greater source of pride and accomplishment, rather than beneficiary feedback. Without the public's awareness, however, such symbolism was one-sided, and the ritual lacked the equally vital component of the public elevating the client from their liminal state.

Indeed, as Worrall and Hoy [2005] warn, there is the potential that without the development of social capital, any positive growth achieved in unpaid work will lack any long-term embedding. Although the long-term effects and consequences of unpaid work are beyond the scope of this research, it is nevertheless a concerning implication worthy of consideration that, without entrenchment, the observed developments of clients may well

falter.

Of course, a more explicit, public-facing stance in unpaid work is fraught with danger when it comes to the signification of said work, and the realities that can construct. There is the omnipresent risk that public involvement may backfire, inviting negative perceptions of the client that humiliate, alienate and ostracise them, rather than building a long-term relationship [Pamment and Ellis, 2010]. Thus, there may be some advantages to the client-centric, internalist reality constructed by the CPO in this observed practice. For instance, the secondment of the public as a symbolic catalyst to the client's own sense of satisfaction and personal growth side-steps Weaver's concern about the dichotomisation of stakeholders in co-produced justice [2011], wherein the public secures the mantle of 'primary/most legitimate' beneficiary and as a result risks marginalising clients. It could be argued that the CPO herein observed avoided this risk by erring to the other end of the spectrum, diminishing the public's involvement to the extent that they weren't even consciously involved (again challenging any possibility of unpaid work allowing for co-produced, mutually supportive outcomes), but at least such an alternative prevented the clients from perceiving themselves as exploited for the benefit of another party.

This challenge to the supposed primacy of the public's position in unpaid work has parallels in Bazemore and Maloney's key criteria for community service [1994]. The argument is posited that the work, especially the quality of its completion, should be the focus of attention; the consequent benefit of such a focus is that it allows for clients to be perceived (both by others and themselves) as essential and necessary source of support in tackling a problem or addressing a need. While being perceived in a different light by wider stakeholders remains limited by the CPO's lack of performative audience, the emphasis on a 'stronger self-image' has a clear parallel with the significance of unpaid work's social reality for clients - and, to the beneficiaries' credit, in positive cases they do act as a surrogate for a wider

notion of community, providing the client with the necessary reinforcement of accomplishment, worthwhile effort, improvement, closure and (at least on a personal level) recognition.

The Results of Work - Client-Developed Development

In determining the social reality of unpaid work through the completion of its tasks, it would appear, at face value, that the client is dominant in this determination. While undoubtedly the beneficiary still has considerable contextual power in the selection and framing of tasks to enable the process of work becoming meaningful to clients, the focal perspective of the results is nevertheless that of the client. The power of their personal connection to the work is a quintessential example of discourse theory's concept of how stakeholders can make a subject relevant to themselves; even in instances of odd-jobs, the moment of reflection upon completion allows clients to forge some meaning, and some limited value, to the work. Their perception, no matter the extent to which it is a post-hoc construction, comes to define the work in their memory. A retrospective perspective that even clearing a storage lot can at least be understood as a positive contribution to the beneficiary organisation. While this is undoubtedly a product of the beneficiaries' influence upon the client perspective, and perhaps even a moment of shared, empathic belief in the value of the organisation (and thus any work, even menial work, that so benefits it), it is nevertheless the clients' perspective that embeds the definition into social reality.

But it is in meaningful work that the greater implications of unpaid work's results-driven social reality are to be found. More than simply perceiving the work through an impression made by beneficiaries, meaningful work is a complex, personal universe into which external forces - beneficiaries along with an unwitting public - can project social forces. Nevertheless, it was the clients, in processing and incorporating these forces, that came to define the work, and their effort therein. More than simply odd-

jobs that were good because the organisation was, meaningful work was a contribution - a vital work carefully chosen to reflect the perceptions of clients.

Contribution had consequence. Lasting impact on the context of the work site that continued, and thus reinforced in a feedback loop, the client meanings invested in the work. An increase in the site's value, positive results in its operation, and utilisation by either the beneficiaries or visiting members of the public - these were continuations and vindications of the perspectives with which clients had approached the work. Undoubtedly, beneficiaries at this point had a highly influential role to play in either reinforcing or, far less frequently (but nevertheless, potentially), undermining that client perception. Their feedback gave external voice to what was otherwise an internal belief; expressions of gratitude, approval and value corroborated what clients already felt about their effort. And while beneficiaries rarely lauded the workers to the same extent as their work, to some extent they did not need to; in affirming clients' belief that the work was worthy of positive regard, they consequently (and implicitly) affirmed the clients' worth as well. Indeed, beyond this, beneficiaries were able to expand client perceptions, incorporating them into the membership, however temporarily or provisionally, of the work site to share in its accumulated impact.

On the other hand, even in instances where beneficiaries' responses were perceived as perfunctory, this was nevertheless a product of, and influence upon, clients' perceptions as a determinant of the work's social reality. The work had not changed, but rather the key variable was clients' sense of the work's meaning, undermined from a valuable contribution to a sense of obligation and exploitation. Indeed, with the exception of one instance in which a beneficiary explicitly ignored the contribution of clients, even this negative conclusion to the work was a product of client perception: beneficiaries may not have deliberately undermined clients, or intentionally disrespected their efforts, but nevertheless clients regarded their responses

as incommensurate to the work. Without that vindication and corroboration of clients' dawning positive perceptions of their work, the older and more fundamental perceptions of unpaid work as a generally-imposed mandate to labour resurfaced, dominating client perceptions and thus, by consequence, the social reality of unpaid work.

The public served a similar role in the mechanics of reality determination, even without realising they were doing so. The physical nature of meaningful work gave the work in question purpose; projects were built with a use in mind. In so using the completed project, and finding some value in its convenience, utility or pleasure, the public further vindicated both client perceptions and beneficiary affirmations. Their physical interaction with the project was as much a repertoire of discourse as beneficiaries' vocabulary of gratitude. Indeed, such a repertoire did not require members of the public to be aware of their role in an implicit, physically symbolic response to clients' efforts. In using the project, they said all they needed to say to the project's realisers.

That does not, however, mean that the public said all they could say, and it is here we encounter the limitations of the social reality produced by unpaid work's results. In the previous chapter's conclusion, the challenge of a vastly more internalised unpaid work was discussed with reference to established literature on community service: how the absence of an external, symbolic, interactive dimension with the public necessitated a reconsidering of ideas such as 'reparation' or 'atonement'. This same issue arises here, only now the practical consequences (or, indeed, meaningful lack thereof) need to be considered instead.

While the process of reality production as an outcome of the client's own internal perceptual universe was instrumental in achieving the aforementioned results, and potentially sidestepping corruptive, externally-imposed significances or conflicts of interest [Pamment and Ellis, 2010; Weaver, 2011], this also had limitations. The lack of an external (especially public-facing) dimension to unpaid work's results restricted the impact of its

social reality. Without a rationale that explicitly engaged the public, whether in practical terms such as providing help for individuals in need (rather than organisations with needs) [McIvor, 1992, 1998 and 2010], or symbolically through expressions of reparation or reconciliation [Maruna, 2011], the culmination of unpaid work did not allow for linkages to be formed between clients and members of the public [Bazemore and Boba, 2007; Fox, 2016]. On a symbolic level, as already suggested, this did have the advantage of retaining a perceptual purity for clients and their interpretation of unpaid work, without any imposition of what the work 'should' or 'had to' mean.

However, on a more pragmatic level, without any interaction with the public, whether directly social or indirectly symbolic, unpaid work was unable to achieve any long-term consequences. While clients were able to form ongoing, human- and social capital-developing linkages with beneficiaries, such formations were the product of positive circumstances, rather than any deliberate design integrated into unpaid work [cf. Raynor, 2001]. The same could be said of the public: without either direct contact with the public through projects, or a symbolic notion of personal 'help' (rather than simple 'contribution'), the public's capacity to support clients' development both socially and societally is non-existent. The public's perception of the client does not change because, in the public's perception, the client does not exist. And if the client does not exist, the public (especially members of the geographic locality or even simply significant stakeholders to the interaction) cannot come to regard the client as a positive member of society, worthy of assistance [Young, 1979; Brownlee, 1998; Bottoms, 2008].

This may very well be indicative of the greatest obstacle facing unpaid work as observed here in the CPO: a product of the beneficiaries' framing that produces a fatal disjunction between their perception of unpaid work and that of clients. The notion of the client as a semi-private worker, pseudo-employed by the organisation as an abstract meta-beneficiary, limits interactions both on an individual level with beneficiaries, and a wider level with the public. Theoretically, there is little that prevents the work clients do

on CPO unpaid work from achieving the same mutual, supportive linkages discussed by Maruna, McIvor, Raynor and others. Indeed, beneficiaries are positioned not only to provide ongoing reinforcement of clients' new status, but potential human capital development and practical social capital in the form of employment and/or references, not to mention facilitating positive perception amongst the public. But that vital sense of 'help' or 'doing good' is tarnished by the contextual reframing of clients as a form of employee, skewing beneficiaries' perspective to hinder the formation of such a shared perception, and consequent social reality.

This presents a challenge in terms of clients' improved self-perception. Whilst unpaid work, especially the culmination of meaningful projects, has been observed to increase clients' sense of self-worth and positive potential [Morris, 1993; McNeill and Maruna, 2008; Cross, 2017], without any wider network that shares in such a perception, and are potentially willing to act upon it, this improvement is untethered and potentially fragile. Without reliable beneficiary support to provide an ongoing connection to the source and stimuli of clients' development, or a wider public response to help integrate such perceptions into clients' long-term change, the positive dividends of unpaid work risk becoming temporary peaks in a client's life, before they return to their pre-work status quo. Whilst public acknowledge of what, at the moment, amounts to invisible effort would not on its own support clients' growth, the opportunities presented by a more explicit, interactive stance - demonstrable human capital, the potential of new social linkages, and a consequently supportive network of contacts - would have clear benefits for long-term desistance.

This should not diminish the impressive perceptual changes that the current formulation of unpaid work and its results can achieve with clients. Such achievements are not failures, merely half-realised successes.

Chapter 11 - CPO Social Realities and the Concept of 'Community'

Concluding an explorative research project is challenging because such a project's value is to be found, by its inherent nature, in the rich, detailed and complex findings it produces. The aspiration of the following two chapters, therefore, is not to attempt a reduction of what has preceded into easily digestible bites of information. Rather, by returning to the introduction of this project and its discussion of the social realities envisaged by CPO policy, the findings of both case studies can be brought together in order to consider their impact upon the wider landscape - not only how they challenge policy assumptions and assertions, but how they contribute to established theories and research in academic literature. To this end, the twin policy concepts of 'community' and 'payback' remain a useful bridging device. The findings of this research have significant implications for many of the themes raised in the prior discussion of those concepts, and such themes also serve to structure the findings' most valuable literature contributions.

Passive Recipient of Unilateral Client Effort

Before their contribution to academic discourse can be considered, however, it is necessary to first consider how the findings of both case studies impact the core policy vision of the CPO. Such is the challenge to policy's conceptualisation of 'community' that it warrants its own stand-alone discussion.

At its most basic level, the concept of community is presented by CPO policy as the passive recipient of unilateral client effort - receiving either reparation from the client (envisaged as typically achieved through unpaid work), or improved local safety due to the client's rehabilitation [Scottish Government, 2010a, p1]. However, as has been seen throughout the findings of both this research's case studies, the community - whether understood as a local geographic area or the wider notion of law-abiding society - was not

perceived as such in frontline practice. The change-work undertaken by clients and supported by their supervisors was only consequently understood by the latter as achieving public protection, while the organisational nature of unpaid work supplanted oblivious local residents and general law-abiding society as its benefitting recipients. While it can be said, from a broader, non-interactive perspective, that policy's conceptualisation of 'community' still received benefit in the forms envisaged - practical work was undertaken to balance out the supposed damage of offending, and clients achieved a state of non-offending (however temporary) - that is, as supervisors noted with public protection, a consequence of the interactions that constituted the CPO, rather than an integrated facet of their social reality.

With regards to the supervision requirement, the findings of this research reflect those noted by Anderson et al. in their evaluation of CPOs:

"[T]he role of the social worker in Supervision appears key to engagement and compliance with the order. Offenders regularly reported that their relationship with their case manager helped them change their behaviour, reduce or stop offending behaviour and to achieve compliance." [2015, p114]

What this research indicates beyond that evaluation, however, is how the centrality of this relationship between client and supervisor replaced policy's vision of 'paying back by working at change'. Clients undertook change-work for their own benefit, not the community's, and supervisors likewise supported them based on, and driven by, a personalised understanding and desire to help clients as individuals, not as an instrumental means to a societal end. Like the testimonials used in Anderson et al.'s evaluation, supervisor encouragement, motivation, help and support achieved both meaningful practical benefits for clients, but also encouraged personal growth and change. This research supports their finding that motivation was linked with a personal tailoring of supervision to a client's

personal interests or potential self-improvements [2015, p114-5], but again it must be stressed that the social reality constituted here was based upon the client, not the community.

Indeed, if the social reality explored in this research reinforces any policy conceptualisation of 'community', it is not that found in the CPO, but later Scottish community justice strategy [2016]. The environmental challenges encountered by clients and supervisors, and the inability of supervision to largely overcome such obstacles to change, reinforces the strategy's emphasis on achieving reintegration through a joined-up strategy based on an inclusive, local asset approach to supporting clients in achieving long-term desistance [2016, p8]. Ironically, it might be said that this emphasis also supports points made in policy before the implementation of the CPO. On the one hand, Scottish Government's recommendation for a Community Service Order includes the recognition that not only must clients return to their own local communities, but therein 'face a number of underlying problems, such as substance misuse, the lack of a stable home or having been a victim of crime themselves' [2007, p16]. Even the McLeish Report [Scottish Prisons Commission, 2008, p43], recognises this challenge and the need for a range of public services, from education and employment to health and housing, to create communities that can provide 'a fair chance for a fresh start'. Thus the findings of this research not only emphasise this increasingly-recognised understanding of 'community' as obstacle rather than recipient, but demonstrate in real, human terms the challenges a client's environment poses to sincere efforts at personal change.

Shifting focus to unpaid work, it is interesting to note that the findings of this research likewise parallel those of Anderson et al. [2015]. Namely, their observation that while unpaid work can be said to be carried out in 'community settings' [p73], and the nature of such work could be said to be 'paying something back' to the communities (i.e. those local areas in which the work was performed), the extent of the public's awareness of such work was noted by their evaluation. In the findings of this research, while the

concept of 'paying back' is better left for the next chapter, it was undoubtedly clear that the sense of contribution to the work site, and the benefit to the visiting members of the public (which might tentatively, and broadly, be described as 'the community') had a meaningful impact on many clients. However, again, this research indicates an expansion beyond what Anderson et al. indicate: the lack of public awareness was not just a failure of benefitting organisations to publicise the work, but a product of the very relationship between said organisations and clients. In this research, the normalisation of clients as quasi-employees of the site, regardless of its benefits, stripped unpaid work of its reparative significance. Clients did not work to serve the community; rather, the community served clients by acting as an unwitting symbol to render clients' use of time and labour as meaningful and worthwhile (comparable to Anderson et al.'s findings [p116], that clients most enjoyed work with a clear benefit to others).

It is important to stress that this is not a negative quality of unpaid work. That the social reality produces personal client growth, rather than simply a return to the status quo ante offence, is a positive finding. But it is also one that challenges assumptions both in policy and Anderson et al. evaluation that just because unpaid work has an external benefit to the local area/society, and that benefit has resonance with the client, then that work is being done 'for the community'. In the social realities observed by this research, clients' unpaid work, like their change-work in supervision, was for no-one but themselves: a productive, positive use of their obliged time enhanced by the public, rather than for them.

Interactive Partner in Payback Relationship

It is perhaps a unsurprising conclusion that, if the social realities observed in this research struggle to achieve the more basic level of unilateral service to the community, then they equally fail to reflect CPO policy's more ambitious vision. It is hard, indeed nigh impossible, for clients

to demonstrate their capacity for change to communities [Scottish Government, 2010b] and elicit their socially inclusive support [Scottish Government, 2016] when no-one outside of the immediate stakeholders to the CPO is aware of the client, let alone their efforts at change or unpaid work. While Anderson et al.'s evaluation of CPOs [2015] also raised the concern of the public's awareness (or lack thereof) regarding the CPO in practice, it did not fully explore the implications of such an absence.

In the absence of the community as an interactive partner in supervision, this research demonstrates that it was undoubtedly the supervisor with whom clients interacted in the most defining manner. Not only were the social realities achieved through these interactions markedly different from that envisaged by policy, but the dynamic was fundamentally distinct. The observations of this research fall altogether more in line with Fenton's [2013] and King's [2013] findings which favour placing supervision as a secondary support service, creating space for the client to share and set their own priorities, facilitating identity transformation and overcoming obstacles to that process. Rather than clients needing to demonstrate their change to an external stakeholder, the greater concern was supervisors demonstrating the sincerity of their belief in and concern for the client. Certainly, a key aspect of the social realities which both Fenton and King overlook is the manner in which these interactions exist within a supervisor-defined framework, but the centrality placed on a client-defined space within supervision is nonetheless vital.

However, the absence of a wider spectrum of interactions can be argued to be a notable concern with the social realities observed within this research. The experience of participant clients with externally brokered, specialist services, for instance, match those of King's [2013] participants - lack of responsiveness, poor management and time-related issues - which ultimately resulted in said agencies struggling to aid clients in addressing the specialist problems they existed to tackle.

However the greater struggle lies in supervision's failure to fully utilise

social capital as a means to facilitate the client change-work upon which it was based. When compared against McNeill and Weaver's [2010, p27] discussion of social capital, it becomes clear that 'bonding social capital' had a strong influence within supervision, wherein close familial and associative ties had a profound effect on client (self-)perception, and consequent motivation and positive identity transformation (parenthood being an especially powerful licit form of social capital, fostering an equally licit identity). This would seem to evidence and advance McNeill's [2009] argument in favour of the desistance linkage between significant others, identity and the development of client agency: as observed in this case study, positive bonding social capital fostered more positive self-identity, which fed into the 'empowerment' approach taken by supervisors in developing client reflection and choice. Indeed, such a process could offer a reframing and solution to Maruna and LeBel's [2010] search for a desistance 'de-labelling' of clients. Not only does it offer the removal of any stigma associated with criminal sanctioning (admittedly not a concern in this case study), but actually goes further and deeper to address negative labels applied to the client by their environment and themselves, with the client likewise offering their own personal, positive alternative grounded in pro-social assets. Indeed, such a process would offer a crucial reconciliation to King's [2012] query of agency, the adoption of new identities, and the question of wider societal forces - on the one hand recognising the necessity of positive structures to encourage and support such adoption (i.e. positive bonding social capital), but also the client's agency in a conscious effort to embrace the identity offered by such structures.

On the other hand, with the centrality of a one-on-one relationship with supervisors, and a lack of wider resources, 'bridging' social capital [McNeill and Weaver, 2010, p27] was highly limited, especially in the crucial field of employment. The challenge, of course, raised by this research is that the local communities within which clients exist are rarely *ab initio* conducive to the kind of 'positive ties' McNeill and Weaver discuss - local culture is

criminogenic, and positive bridging capital in the form of employment, housing and healthcare is limited. Arguably this reinforces the need for specialist services to achieve the generativity discussed by McNeill and Weaver, among others [Bottoms, 2008; McNeill and Maruna, 2008; Weaver and Armstrong, 2011], not only for the sake of the client, but for the criminogenic communities within which they live.

With regards to unpaid work, the observations of this research would seem to vindicate Brownlee's [1998] critical distinction between sanctions which are 'in' the community and those which are 'of' the community - with the observed unpaid work falling decidedly into the former, acting as non-custodial disposal but with no responsibilities placed on the community (or, indeed, beneficiaries) beyond permitting clients' presence. It has already been noted how the lack of public awareness and engagement challenges policy assumptions surrounding unpaid work, but it also challenges established assumptions in literature too. Concepts of unpaid work being some form of symbolic performance by the client to change themselves in the eyes of the community [Young, 1979; Bazemore and Boba, 2007; Bottoms, 2008; Maruna, 2011] could, perhaps, be argued as transferable to the organisational beneficiaries of this research, were it not for the fictional normalisation of clients as pseudo-employees/volunteers, and an equal absence of reciprocal responsibilities experienced by the beneficiaries as a consequence.

Indeed, the more interesting interactive 'community' that arose in unpaid work is arguably the one constructed amongst clients themselves. Such a community, however tentative and ad hoc it was, nevertheless supports (and is, in turn, vindicated by) conceptual arguments that any community is founded on some homogeneous element, and manifests itself in a mutual network of support [Worrall and Hoy, 2005]. Indeed, this client collective actually reframes a recurring literature theme of 'collective efficacy', uprooting the idea of bridging social capital from its implicitly geographic foundations. While it is certainly arguable that clients lack the same

connections and reintegrative potential for one another when compared to beneficiaries, specialist services or a positively functioning community [Bazemore and Boba, 2007], the ethos of people coming together to solve each other's problems for each other's sake, and in receiving the same in turn to create a cohesive collective [Bottoms, 2008], is both present and powerful. What this research would suggest is that this efficacy is not necessarily the product of visibility or demonstrable effort to an external, passive stakeholder (i.e. the community envisaged by policy and traditional literature), but make actually be producible through shared experience and mutual effort - a bridge extant not only between clients themselves, but with emphasis and focus, between clients and more well-connected beneficiaries.

Aspirational Target

Shifting from the concept of 'community' as an envisaged stakeholder in the CPO, policy also indicates its potential role as an aspirational target: a law-abiding collective, the return to which clients make progress over the course of their Order [Scottish Government, 2010a]. Certainly, this vision of 'community' as a state of long-term non-offending does have parallels to the observations made in this research, especially policy's espousal of the supervisor as a means of supporting client desistance, but there is a crucial conceptual distinction. Neither supervision nor unpaid work emphasised a return to, or reintegration into, some envisaged law-abiding collective (indeed, 'community' was often understood as the antithesis of this concept) but rather, respectively, a personal effort to realise a client's ideal lifestyle, or clients' improved self-perception as a result of the public's unconscious response to their work.

Taking this aspirational approach to supervision first, it must once again be noted how this mirrors, yet surpasses, the similar Good Lives Model [Ward, 2010] with whom it shares an interest in client asset development. Whereas the GLM places an emphasis on supervisor-led, standardised

assessment of client assets to support a more treatment-based method of intervention, supervision inverted this formula. Emphasis was placed on the client's perspective of what constituted an asset, and how they sought to deploy or realise it within the indicated framework of where they wanted to see themselves in a year's time. Indeed, this approach arguably expanded beyond Ward's [2010] narrower, offending-centric core concept for the GLM - what motivation a client sought to achieve through their offence - and instead treated offending as an upset to their positive motivation (no client, unsurprisingly, wanted to see themselves serving a CPO in a year's time). In this sense, supervision actually sits closer to Day, Ward and Shirley's [2011] vision of the GLM, not only emphasising the client's perspective, assets and motivation, but the placement of offending as the product of progress-obstructing criminogenic needs. Even then, arguably, the aspirational target towards which the client works is more personal, pertinent and ambitious: the client's own subjective ideal self and state (i.e. the envisaged one-year-from-now), rather than an objective law-abiding collective or standardised 'primary human goods'.

That the client's perspective should play a central role in guiding the supervisory process is not a radical proposal in other models, such as desistance [Fenton, 2013]. Indeed, the findings of this case study not only support King's [2013] emphasis on the facilitative importance of the supervisor's belief in the client, but enhances its importance. With the aspirational focus observed in this research, belief was not simply facilitated, but sought to be internalised within the client as an effort at long-term motivation. Client 'buy in' to supervision [Lewis, 2014] was only the first step to clients buying in to themselves.

With regards to unpaid work, 'community' did not serve so much as an aspirational target for clients. Rather, it is interesting to note how, despite the lack of explicit interactions between clients and the public, the latter nevertheless served as a vital symbolic driver for the former's change. Rather like supervision and the GLM, this indicates a notable inversion of theory:

namely, rather than the client symbolically demonstrating values to the public as a means of altering their perception (e.g. Bazemore and Boba's [2007] argument of civic service to change a client's public image, or Raynor [2001] and Duff's [2003a] theories of atonement and secular penance), it was the public's response to the results of client work that altered client self-perception. Interestingly, this research's findings paralleled Bazemore and Boba's [2007, p43] emphasis on competency and contribution as key demonstrable facets, only rather than the client proving these to the public, the public's valuation of the work (however unwittingly) vindicated these to the client. In this sense, therefore, it may be argued that the public acted, again unconsciously, as a form of 'inclusive' community: a collective of ordinary, law-abiding citizens whose approval of clients' products had a positive influence on their self-perception as worthwhile and valuable. On the one hand, this could therefore challenge Worrall and Hoy's [2005, p69] assertion that the reality of 'community' is one of exclusion, insecurity and opposition. On the other hand, though, the fact that such a symbolic inclusion was achieved without the public's awareness vindicates at least a suspicion that an informed public would respond with such prejudice and hostility.

Similarly, this incognito approach to the symbolic value of the public as 'community' does compare unfavourably with some aspects of theory. Most notably is the explicit link between Bazemore and Boba's [2007, p43] public demonstration of competent contribution, and a consequent opportunity to build social capital in the form of a positive reputation, references and support network. This research's findings do suggest that such capital is not necessarily exclusive to the wider public - the private beneficiaries observed were arguably better placed to provide these assets - but Bazemore and Boba are proven correct on the importance of clients' explicitly demonstrating their worth to another stakeholder. What remains absent is a means to ensure a reciprocal response from said stakeholder as a consequence of such a demonstration.

Challenge to Change

That clients' criminogenic needs are closely linked to their local context and environment is not in itself a radical proposition. While CPO policy focuses on a client's local geography as a potential beneficiary of payback, with attendant presumptions of reparation and reintegration [Scottish Government, 2010a], wider criminal justice policy has continuously recognised this same 'community' as the source of 'underlying problems' [Scottish Government, 2007, p16], 'the social and cultural causes of reoffending' [Scottish Prisons Commission, 2008, p41] and a concentrated site for the linkage between 'material deprivation' and the 'conditions for crime' [Scottish Government, 2017, p20]. The findings of this research do not simply provide this conceptualisation of 'community' as a criminogenic with tangible, personal examples, but demonstrates the challenge to be altogether more considerable: the equal problem 'community' represents as an obstacle to clients changing their lives for the better, and the imperative need for wider social and societal resources to support clients in this effort.

Supervision is, undoubtedly, the more drastic example of this 'community as challenge' concept in action. Certainly, the struggles faced by the supervisor-client relationship when beset by such contextual obstacles vindicates established research [Rex, 1998; Farrall, 2002; McCulloch, 2005] which emphasises both the positivity of agentic 'talking methods', but also their dramatically limited capacity to address social problems without collaborative support from a client's community. What this research further contributes, however, is an examination of the myriad ways the 'community' proves hostile to such support - poor education hindering clients' capacity for reflective thought and decision making; financial pressures from insufficient benefits and housing putting a strain on mental health; frequent emergencies, crises and conflicts that derail sincere motivation; dangerous environments and anti-social cultures that impress dangerous, risky or outright criminal behaviour as a matter of survival.

From a desistance perspective, this 'community as challenge' presents a troubling situation. These findings suggest that these observed clients did not occupy a neutral state - merely the absence of what Giordano et al. [2002] would describe as 'hooks' to achieve change - but rather existed in a negative starting balance. To parallel the metaphor, they already had hooks - what might be described as anti-social counter-capital - which were holding and pulling them back. Raynor [2001, p192] is accurate in this regard when raising the critique that any effort to restore a client to 'a pre-sentence situation' is ineffective due to that situation being 'deprived, criminogenic and generally disadvantageous', but that situation proves equally obstructing in efforts to generate inclusion into new pro-social linkages. Before 'community' can be used in an aspirational sense to denote developing cooperation and support in local areas, the negative reality of the concept must be addressed. While popular support for the CPO will remain a concern on an overarching, public level, on a more local level concern should not be with overcoming community stigma to the client [Spencer and Deakin, 2004] - offending does not place client and community in conflict; rather, efforts at change-work generates dissonance between their subjective efforts and their social situation [McNeill and Whyte, 2007].

Shifting perspectives to unpaid work, the concept of 'community as challenge' does, itself, challenge a prevailing narrative of community service. Namely, the notion that unpaid work can serve as a symbolic effort to the local area of a client's positive qualities [Young, 1979; Bazemore and Boba, 2007]. Offending does not mark the client as an outsider in their local community; with one notable exception, based on rumours intended to cause social ostracisation, no client raised a sensation of becoming an outsider since offending. Such behaviour was simply part of their area's social tapestry.

Although not observed as a deliberate feature of the unpaid work requirement, it is also interesting to note the fact that unpaid work was not performed in any client's local 'community'. Such an observation provides an

interesting new perspective with which to view, for instance, McIvor's [1992; 2010] crucial findings as to clients' perceived valuation of unpaid work. Quality client experiences in those instances were not linked to a geographic, local or otherwise 'community' sense of contribution, or reparation to one's victims or neighbours, but rather work that was of worthwhile value, typically to those in need, and which as a result generated new pro-social connections with those encountered in the process as a form of reciprocation for the work done.

Both these points regarding unpaid work, when taken together, do not so much refute the value of said work as a socially symbolic activity, but rather suggest a reframing of its audience. Maruna's [2011] argument in favour of a reintegrative ritual, for instance, has strong support within the findings of this research. Where clients were able to demonstrate positive qualities to beneficiaries, reciprocal support was offered (the primary difficulty, as has been stressed numerous times, was the narrowness and obliviousness of beneficiaries' perceptions as to what constituted such a demonstration). What this suggests is that community service should be less concerned with demonstrations to the public on a local level as a means to strengthen links [Rex and Gelsthorpe, 2002] which either aren't broken or never existed. Rather, its efforts should be geared towards fostering positive social capital with those - such as the beneficiary organisations observed in this research - who are in a position to provide tangible support to begin countering a client's challenging community. There is certainly the argument that such a stance would remove unpaid work's generative/civil renewal potential [Bottoms, 2008; Weaver and Armstrong, 2011] to actually address the very challenge and obstacles this solution seeks to avoid, but the counter-argument must be posited of how realistic it is to expect unpaid work, as both a practical contribution and symbolic effort, to tackle the deprivation, inequalities and hostilities entrenched in such communities. As Bottoms [2008] himself notes, such collective efficacy requires a willingness of locals to collaborate for the common good, and a pervasive ethos of trust and

support. Given the accounts of challenges and difficulties faced by participant clients in this research, such requirements cannot realistically be expected to be mined from current local, toxic environments by unpaid work groups. Indeed, it might be argued, based on this research's findings, that attempting to achieve a (re)generation of the local community through individual client intervention is placing the cart before the horse.

Community - A More Complex Concept

Although the social realities observed in both this research's case studies profoundly differ from those envisaged by CPO policy, that is not to say that the concept of 'community' is without import or value. While it can be argued that the 'community' benefited from both supervision and unpaid work, the findings herein challenge any assertion of that benefit as a deliberate facet of either requirement. Rather, what is advanced instead is a snapshot of supervision as a client-centric support process and, more novel, of unpaid work as being of greater benefit to the client through the perception of time spent in a worthwhile manner. Wider community justice policy receives greater support from these findings [Scottish Government, 2016; 2017], with its recognition of the criminogenesis that arises from community factors, and the need for broader, societal resources to address this problem, but even here the findings indicate there is more to situation than depicted.

With regards to academic theory and research, there are a good deal of findings and arguments that are supported by this research. Supervision's observations support a strong narrative of individual-facilitating client support [Fenton, 2013; King, 2013], while also challenging more procedurally standardised, objective models [Ward, 2010]. Especially with regards to desistance practice, these findings provide a valuable insight into the dynamics between agency, self-identity, motivation and clients' significant others [McNeill, 2009; Maruna and LeBel, 2010; King, 2012; Lewis, 2014]. However, these findings also emphasise a greater stress is needed on the

importance of wider social capital as a means of realising long-term desistance change [McNeill and Weaver, 2010].

But it is in this final issue of the need for wider social capital that the supervision case study demonstrates a critical need for a broader perspective. Not only do these findings vindicate calls for greater social opportunities and hooks to support a transition into a law-abiding lifestyle [Giordano et al., 2002; McCulloch, 2005], but pointedly emphasise the drastic challenge faced by clients in their current environmental context [Raynor, 2001]. The experiences of clients facing limited resources and hostile neighbourhoods makes a clear call not only for viewing clients as existing in an initial state of negative social capital, but reframing community engagement from a question of individual reintegration and generativity [Rex and Gelsthorpe, 2002], to wide-scale societal investment and regeneration.

Unpaid work presents greater challenges to several conventional narratives. Most predominant of these is the observed lack of awareness from, and interaction with, any group amongst the public that might be defined as a 'community', replaced with organisational beneficiaries as the key stakeholder counterpart. While this does not necessarily undermine theories that espouse the potential value of unpaid work as a symbolic performance to transform client identity and inspire reciprocal support [Young, 1979; Bazemore and Boba, 2007; Bottoms, 2008; Maruna, 2011], it does indicate the need to shed assumptions that the audience of such symbolism, and the source of the hoped-for reciprocation, is locally-sourced members of the public. As this research demonstrates, organisational beneficiaries arguably have greater resources to provide meaningful support, but their perceptual frameworks come with unique challenges - not least amongst them, a benevolent but flawed normalisation of clients.

The findings from the unpaid work case study also indicate a necessary reframing of the very concept of 'community' [Worrall and Hoy, 2005; Bottoms, 2008] to explore the novel phenomenon of the spontaneous, mutually-supportive client collectives observed during this requirement.

Although such a collective lacks even the resources of a local network of support, its efforts to draw upon the personal experiences of clients to provide advice and moral support suggests a crucial reconceptualisation of collective efficacy, both in terms of how it is formed and utilised.

Chapter 12 - CPO Social Realities and the Concept of 'Payback'

Much in the same what that, over the course of this thesis' findings chapters the penal significance of stakeholder interactions was important due to its absence, so too might it be argued that the policy concept of 'payback' is an important discussion point because it was not raised in stakeholder interactions either. It is not an exaggeration to say that, over the course of both case studies, the term 'payback' was not used once, and similar notions of reparation or restitution were relegated to clients' initial perceptions of their CPO requirements (often followed up by the recognition that the social reality did not reflect that). But can that indeed be said of the CPO - that just because 'payback' was not an explicit concept in stakeholder interactions, those interactions have no implications for the concept? After all, it has already been noted that, while the core policy concepts of 'community' were not paralleled in the social realities observed by this research, those realities still had important consequences for wider and arguably more nuanced themes of the same concept. Thus, likewise, even although 'payback' did not manifest itself in this research's social realities, they have altogether more to say on the concept than its non-existence.

Unilateral Reparation by Clients

As with the preceding chapter, it is worthwhile starting the discussion of how this research's findings advance existing thought with the foundations of CPO policy. Once again there is a distinct and crucial difference between the social realities observed in these case studies, and the assertions made as to the role of 'payback' within the CPO.

While CPO policy itself is comparatively vague on the concept of 'payback' - that it is achieved through reparation or rehabilitation [Scottish Government, 2010a] - the McLeish Report, as the concept's originator in policy, provides a more productive initial point of comparison:

"When issues of seriousness and dangerousness do not arise, the focus [of sentencing] should be on finding the most appropriate and constructive way to get the offender to payback to the victim and/or society. In essence, payback means finding constructive ways to compensate or repair harms caused by crime. It involves making good to the victim and/or the community." [Scottish Prisons Commission, 2008, p27]

Clearly, the findings of this research differ from that core definition of payback. Ideas of compensation, reparation or even a broader notion of 'making good' were absent from both case studies. This is perhaps unsurprising, given that all three of these terms place the client in the position of a debtor - that their wrongdoing has incurred upon them an onus to pay back to their victim, local community, or society at large. Given the recurring absence of a punitive element in both case studies, such a reparative ethos found no purchase on supervision or unpaid work's social realities; even the latter's obliged 'fine on time' was abstracted in clients' perceptions, unlinked to any sense of debt or compensatory imperative.

This diversion from payback, however, is not a radical proposition. When one considers the policy surrounding, for instance, the supervision requirement, this research actually highlights a tension latent within the requirement. Consider, for instance, the National Outcomes and Standards for Social Work Services that accompanied the CPO [Scottish Government, 2010b]: discussion of aspects such as the case management plan or behaviour contracts worked out between supervisors and clients make passing reference to assisting the client in 'providing payback' [p26], but lack any meaningful clarification. By contrast, there is extensive detail given tackling criminogenic needs, facilitating desistance, pursuing reintegration and achieving a working partnership with clients. Unsurprisingly, this focus was paralleled in the interactions observed by this research: neither

supervisor nor client made any mention of their collective efforts being intended to 'pay back by working at change' (beyond supervisors' recognition of consequent public protection), whereas an individual driven, rapport-facilitated dynamic focussed on supporting client change-work dominated the requirement's social realities.

Even the McLeish Report, wherein the term 'paying back by working at change' is coined [Scottish Prisons Commission, 2008, p33] swiftly shifts discursive focus to the underlying problems of offending, concerned more with achieving meaningful 'working at change' through providing effective support than getting the client to 'pay back'. While it might be said that, like public protection, society nevertheless benefits from successful long-term client desistance, this research posits a challenge. Much as whether, if a tree falls unnoticed in the woods, it makes a sound, if society gains a consequent benefit of client change, but their benefit was not intended by the client, is that really 'payback'? If, as the findings of this research indicate, there is no undertaking to have the client perceive their change as an act of reparation, can its social reality be called such regardless?

Unpaid work provides a potentially more complicated answer to this question. While it has already been noted that even its fundamental punitive quality - the 'fine on time' - did not generate a sense of compensation, reparation or 'making good', the social realities observed in this research are nonetheless more complex with regards to 'payback'. Those findings concerning the sense of contribution achieved through meaningful work reflect policy discussions concerning the 'tangible benefits' unpaid work should achieve for its beneficiaries [Scottish Government, 2010b, p33]. Although even here there is an important distinction to be drawn between two conflicting rationales: the desire amongst observed clients to use their time in a worthwhile manner, and the 'payback' rationale in policy to repair the harm caused by offending [Scottish Government, 2010b, p69].

Yet the sense of contribution amongst many clients, and the improvement in self-perception thereby achieved, does indicate some bridge,

if not to a sense of reparation (absent, as these social realities were, a sense of undoing clients' wrongdoing [Scottish Government, 2010b, p70], at least a sense of positive impact. That, as a bare minimum, reflects criteria raised by Anderson et al. [2015, p73], which distinguishes, but nonetheless links, the reparative nature of unpaid work with a 'clear tangible benefit to the local community'. Certainly this sense of benefit was likewise paralleled in their evaluation as a key perceptual element amongst clients, and had a material impact on unpaid work's social realities - namely, whether clients found the requirement worthwhile (or, in Anderson et al.'s terminology, 'enjoyable' [2015, p116]). Indeed, the findings of this research provide a valuable link between client enjoyment, and the behavioural change aspects of the CPO noted by Scottish Government [2017a], given the self-perceptual improvement that positively-perceived, meaningfully contributive work achieved amongst observed clients.

'Working at Change' and Community Reintegration

'Payback' does, however, demonstrate the potential for greater complexity as a concept in policy's discussion of 'paying back by working at change'. More than a mere unilateral act of reparation, it can instead be understood as a reciprocal exchange, wherein the client's efforts at payback are met with 'opportunities for reintegration' [Scottish Government, 2010a, p1]. However, while the findings of this research do demonstrate reintegration as a significant theme in both supervision and unpaid work's social realities (albeit for different reasons), such a theme was not predicated on clients' efforts at payback, nor did reintegration opportunities come from local 'communities'. In supervision, case study findings support an interpretation of policy that instead places reintegration as another aspect of a client's own change progress, supported by their supervisor. In unpaid work, on the other hand, it could be argued that the distinct absence of an explicitly reparative rationale was a contributing factor to beneficiaries' failure to reciprocate

clients' labour with the opportunity for social capital assets (not only supporting Anderson et al.'s [2015, p73] suggestion that unpaid work is 'being carried out in community settings', but suggesting that the lack of reintegration support is not only a failure of public awareness, but beneficiary reciprocation).

To consider supervision first, the emphasis on achieving successful reintegration was understood within a wider desistance notion of clients ceasing their offending, and was the fundamental focus of the requirement rather than a conditional exchange with some 'community'. Indeed, it has been noted, even when the client was not willing to engage in change-work, supervisors still endeavoured to provide some degree of lifestyle-improving support. In this sense, there is a clear comparison to be made with Fenton's stance on desistance, particularly the idea of the 'positive rights agenda' [2013, p86] - that meaningful engagement by a supervisor, founded on ideas of supporting a client's own journey, listening to their perspective and priorities, assisting with problems and the generation of a 'therapeutic relationship', is an inherent right for the client. While the terminology of 'rights' was not used by either group of participants in this case study, the idea of seeking to support clients in their change-work was not conditional upon some perceived level of payback or involvement; it was offered, even to the most reluctant and unwilling because that was what supervisors perceived to be their professional, and on many occasions personal, ethos.

While it is undoubtedly correct to say that CPO policy 'places reparation centre stage' [McNeill, 2010, p5], shifting the ideas of reintegration and restoration to consequences of a reparative prerequisite, the predominant feature of supervision's social realities remained an unqualified core of rehabilitation. Supervisors were not concerned with notions of 'justice' for any party other than the client overcoming the obstacles to their ideal, law-abiding life - neither victims nor any notion of 'community' warranted client payback, and indeed the latter was viewed more as a source of criminogenic challenge than a recipient of reparation. While supervisors

acknowledged McNeill's conceptual reframing on an external level - especially how a reparative gloss 'sells' the CPO to the public - the frontline practice of mutually working with clients to achieve rehabilitation remained absent any such prerequisites or conditions.

Unpaid work, on the other hand, evokes one of the most fundamental findings of community service research, albeit with distinct changes. With regards to the link between paying back and reintegration/rehabilitation, there is an essential parallel with McIvor's landmark findings [1992] that unpaid work that allowed for positive contact with members of the public achieved a transformation in clients' perceptions: that their work was useful and beneficial, and that the consequent community links acted as a worthwhile change factor for said clients. While the absence of such linkages was a notable limitation of the social realities observed in this research, it is interesting to note how the unpaid work case study mirrors, yet also distinguishes itself, from this core contact between client and public. Without direct contact with the public, or ongoing linkages, the normative effect of unpaid work is a symbolic one, albeit still founded on a sense of the work being useful and beneficial. The positivity is instead to be found in how the public engages with the work as a product of the clients, and that positivity then transfers to the client as the work's producer, thereby enhancing their self-perception. In comparison to McIvor's recidivism-reducing social linkages, especially given the observed absence of such linkages in this case study, such identity transformation may be viewed as somewhat second-place, but it is nonetheless a sophisticated (however unintended) facet of unpaid work's social reality. Indeed, while it fails compared to the social linkages in McIvor's findings, when one compares perceptions amongst clients [McIvor, 2010], those in this study may arguably appear more complex: their positivity is not merely grounded in a sense of the requirement being legitimate, worthwhile or useful in terms of new skills acquired, but has actually touched a deeper normative aspect of their personalities to show them their positive, contributive potential.

This, however, does once again distinguish the reintegrative change potential of a CPO requirement from the concept 'payback'. Weaver and Armstrong [2011], for instance, demonstrate findings remarkably similar to the symbolic, personally-transformative aspect of unpaid work discussed here - an 'affective, or emotional, dimension to the experience of giving help' [p12] that made clients feel good about themselves. But in their research such a dimension was predicated on a symbolism of 'repaying your debt' or 'putting something back into the community' or simply the idea of 'recompense'. The distinction between 'giving' and 'giving back' may be a matter of semantics, but it is semantics that are at the core of the CPO's proposition. Once again comparing participants, clients in this research did not discuss their wrongdoing, and consequently did not frame their work as an act of recompense. What is interesting is that Weaver and Armstrong [2011, p31] later discuss a shift away from stigmatisation in payback, but nonetheless retain a core stigma of the client as an individual in need of redemption, or in a position of some moral debt. What these findings would suggest is that the same envisaged transformation of personal identity through generativity - a committed improvement to society, however small - can be achieved not only without a conscious public, but without this precondition of debt. Clients were not reconceptualising themselves as positive contributors because they had undone their wrongdoing; they reconceptualised themselves as positive contributors simply because they had made a positive contribution (with the fact that was done during obliged attendance of a requirement not even factoring into their perceptions).

Punishment vs. Supportive Intervention

The absence of punishment as an aspect of either CPO requirements' social reality has been a recurring aspect of this research's findings, and indicates that in the policy balance between the CPO as punishment and supportive intervention [Scottish Government, 2010a], observed frontline

practice leaned considerably towards the latter. Supervision did not incorporate any palpable perception of punishment beyond the spectre of breach proceedings, while unpaid work's 'fine on time' was eclipsed by clients' own desire to see their time used in a worthwhile manner. Not even the McLeish Report's more communicative notions [Scottish Prisons Commission, 2008] of payback as a means for client self-reflection, apology and redemption manifested themselves in practice.

At first instance, the obvious conclusion to be drawn from these particular findings is a vindication of long-held academic arguments that punishment has no place in a probation relationship, and needs restriction within community service. While, for instance, Hignett's [2000, p52] description of punishment as the seeking of 'pain and suffering' is not an accurate reflection of the punishment envisioned by CPO policy, Mair and Canton's [2007] concerns about rigour and discipline cooling the probation relationship, and especially Robinson and Ugwudike's [2012] warning that punishment necessitates some demonstration thereof, appear vindicated by the observed focus on a client-centric, supportive supervisory relationship (again, noticeably absent any public dividend beyond its consequent benefits). Unpaid work, on the other hand, presented a more complex relationship to established theory. Certainly it avoided a punitive spectacle imposed upon the client, subjecting deliberately hard, worthless and humiliating work upon the client [Pamment and Ellis, 2010] (even the most mundane of odd-jobs was not perceived in such terms). However, the social realities observed in this requirement do challenge other visions of unpaid work. On the one hand, the argument that the requirement to attend unpaid work has a disciplining effect on clients [Morris, 1993] is not reflected in the social realities observed, but on the other the argument that the performance of work to a given quality fosters in beneficiaries a perception of clients as competent, reliable and trustworthy [Bazemore and Boba, 2007] does seem to hold merit. However, while the need to attend unpaid work and perform tasks to a certain standard as a part thereof is undoubtedly linked to the

punitive 'fine on time' aspect of the requirement, both the fictionalised nature of beneficiaries perceiving clients as quasi-volunteers, and the associated positive framing of their work as a result, arguably divorces this facet of observed interactions from this concept of punishment. Rather, it suggests that ideas of 'discipline' or 'rigour' are not the sole monopoly of punishment, but can be interpreted more broadly as characteristics of any worker performing a task for another (and may, rather, be indicative of the power dynamic between beneficiary and client).

However, the question must be asked: if CPO policy recognises the possible, and potentially even beneficial, hybridisation of punishment and supportive intervention, doesn't the former's absence in these findings indicate a missing element? With regards to supervision, a contrast can be made between the lack of punishment significance in this research's findings and theories such as Duff's [2003] and Robinson's [2008], wherein punishment can serve a valuable moral communication to clients not only of prior wrongdoing, but pro-social development as a result. Such theories do certainly sit uneasily with the emphasis in supervision's case study on the toxic community origins of clients' criminal behaviour, but on the other hand even core desistance concepts such as the redemption script [Maruna, 2001, p87] are able to marry a recognition of criminogenic societal pressures with clients' 'deviance'. As a result, they emphasise not only a practical, support-driven process to achieve meaningful client change, but reinforce that with an internal self-narrative of 'goodness', 'conventionality' and 'giving back'. While the findings of this particular case study may arguably suggest that a crucial element for identity transformation is the personal belief and support of a supervisor, it may also be argued that a failure to recognise a contextual fact of supervision - that the client has received this as a sentence for committing an offence - also fails to make use of another facet that could potentially serve as additional support.

Similarly, unpaid work emphasises the potential of punishment as an untapped resource. Pamment and Ellis [2010], for instance, discuss a

proximate concept of reintegrative/constructive shaming, wherein the denunciation of punishment is followed by forgiveness and acceptance through the medium of unpaid work as an act of making amends. Weaver and Armstrong [2011] likewise reiterate the redemptive aspects of desistance, enhancing a client's self-perception through the undoing of past mistakes by an act of construction. Where the case studies for supervision and unpaid work differ in this aspect, however, is that unpaid work demonstrated a palpable and significant alternative to this proposal: clients were already able to transform their self-perception into that of a positive contributor without the need for a sense of forgiveness, redemption or undoing of past actions.

What the findings from unpaid work do emphasise, however, is the importance of such perceptions not for the client, but for the beneficiaries of unpaid work. Weaver and Armstrong [2011] articulate it perfectly with the term 'recognition' - not only does the client perceive themselves as transformed into a positive contributor, but their beneficiaries do so as well, not only reinforcing this new identity but responding to it in a supportive manner. For all it avoided harmful consequences, the observed normalisation of clients by beneficiaries denied them this recognition; the absence of a recognition that unpaid work is a punishment denies, in turn, narratives such as redemption or second chances [Maruna and King, 2008]. But consequently, and more importantly, it removes the imperative of the beneficiary 'audience' to respond to this symbolic act of 'making good' and commensurate personal change with the provision of reintegrative support [Maruna, 2011]. Indeed, the findings of this research only serve to reinforce this argument by the crucial absence observed in unpaid work, where beneficiaries were ideally positioned to provide social capital to clients, yet lacked the imperative to do so because clients were not framed in such terms. Thus this case study arguably serves to illustrate that, actually, the stigma associated with narratives of punishment, reparation and redemption may, if handled correctly, actually serve a more productive long-term goal than the

immediately positive, but factually fictional, normalisation of clients.

Constructive Effort

One of the alternative conceptualisations of 'payback' present in earlier policy is the idea of constructive effort, placing less emphasis on client wrongdoing and instead focussing on the opportunity to 'make good' to victims and/or the community [Scottish Prisons Commission, 2008]. The findings of both case studies in this research certainly sit more comfortably with this conceptualisation. Supervision reflects the CPO's National Outcomes and Standards in a case management approach that is more concerned with engagement and change-work [Scottish Government, 2010b, p25], and a wider community justice ethos that emphasises individualisation and responsivity to reintegration [Scottish Government, 2016]. The one major failing that these observations into supervision would, however, emphasise, is the greater need for multi-agency partnership to promote successful social inclusion for clients. Unpaid work, on the other hand, would indicate a reframing of the term 'making good', removing it from its implicitly reparative framework and instead allow it to stand independently - closer to 'doing good', based on the symbolic value that meaningful tasks had for observed clients. Indeed, as already noted in its findings chapters, the findings of the unpaid work case study would suggest 'constructive' as a more apt term for the work undertaken, as opposed to 'reparative'.

Focussing first on supervision, it is worth noting how the social realities observed likewise emphasise the notion of 'constructive' effort independent of wider reparative obligations. The nature of this constructive effort interacts interestingly with wider literature: for instance, on the one hand it supports Weaver and Armstrong's [2011, p8] findings that offenders likewise perceived probation 'as a rehabilitative mechanism in terms of receiving help... to help them to move on from offending and to address the consequences it had had on their lives', but did not incorporate the same retrospective focus on

offending behaviour, instead emphasising the more prospective ('constructive') elements of individualised support to achieve desistance and overcome problems/obstacles. Thus this notion of constructive effort is more in line with the core ethos of probation as discussed in Annison, Eadie and Knight's [2008] findings, wherein probation officers emphasised individual focus, commitment to helping achieve change, and seeking solution to problems (conspicuously absent more offending-centric aspects).

However, it is also worth noting a distinction between the findings of the supervision case study and academic literature that would also fall within this 'constructive' rubric. Robinson et al.'s [2014] work, for instance, not only covers similar aspects of one-to-one engagement, individualised understanding, and problem solving, but also emphasised the need for effective brokerage with other agencies to support clients. This ties in appropriately with the policy distinction discussed above, thus emphasising the crucial point to be taken from these observations into supervision. Namely, that no matter how 'constructive' the individual relationship is between supervisor and client, wider resources are essential to realise the long-term change sought by this approach.

Indeed, there is a certain parallel to be drawn between the constructive efforts observed in supervision and unpaid work. While supervision sought to work with the client to construct a positive, non-offending life but struggled due to limited wider resources, unpaid work succeeded in more literal constructions - the physical products of unpaid work - but likewise struggled in this wider construction for its clients despite the presence of such resources in the form of beneficiaries. It is unfortunate that, while community service literature is abundant with the sociogenic potential of unpaid work [McIvor, 1998; Marshall, 1999; Robinson and Shapland, 2008; Maruna, 2011; Graham, 2016], the findings of this research ultimately demonstrate this requirement faltering to achieve such a network of support. This is unfortunate, as the improvement clients experienced in their own self-perception due to the contribution of their work neatly parallels

many of the values expressed in such literature - competency, reliability, skill and positive impact, for instance [Bazemore and Boba, 2007].

However, as suggested in the previous section of this chapter, in so faltering we might at least take an important point of learning away from this case study: this sense of positive contribution is not exclusive to public interactions, and evidently does not guarantee networks of support will be formed as a result. Rather, these findings engage with more beneficiary-centric theories [Young, 1979; Brownlee, 1998; Bazemore and Boba, 2007; Bottoms, 2008] to instead emphasise the importance of activating their reciprocal role to play in supporting reintegration and long-term desistance. What this research especially demonstrates, however, is that the default perceptual state of such beneficiaries is not necessarily punitive, but either indifferent or, indeed, obfuscatingly positive.

Payback - A Notable Absence

Much as with the concept of 'community', 'payback' illustrates a considerable disparity between the social realities observed in this research, and those espoused by CPO policy. The central proposal of 'finding constructive ways to compensate or repair harms' [Scottish Prisons Commission, 2008, p27] simply do not find purchase with the observations in either case study: supervision was conducted to support the client's change for their own sake, with only the broadest sense of public protection as a consequent benefit; unpaid work, while rendering 'tangible benefits' [Scottish Government, 2010b, p33] to beneficiaries (and by extension, the public), was perceived as a positive contribution rather than an act of reparation.

However, unlike the concept of 'community', it is hard to argue that the findings of this research demonstrate the concept appreciably in other forms. Rather, when considered from the perspective of the wider academic literature, it is arguably the absence of payback and its associated facets that provides the most meaningful contributions to ongoing discourse.

The supervision case study, for instance, reaffirmed the centrality of a client-supportive change effort without any secondment to notions of risk or reparation [McNeill, 2010; Fenton, 2013], with supervisors suggesting that the CPO's reparative emphasis is a 'gloss' to encourage support amongst the public. The similar absence of a punishment-based aspect to the observed social realities of supervision, on the one hand vindicates a prevalent ethos in academic literature that views such an aspect as inimical to the supervisor-client relationship [Hignett, 2000; Mair and Canton, 2007; Robinson and Ugwudike, 2012]. On the other hand, it may be argued that supervision, in completely removing not only any mention of punishment, but any normative discussion of past offending, demonstrates a distinct inability to engage with clients on a commensurately normative level [Maruna, 2001; Duff, 2003; Robinson, 2008]. While it is arguable such a retrospective, moral dimension is not compatible with the more prospective, aspirational process observed herein [Annison, Eadie and Knight, 2008], on the other hand there exists the argument that ignoring the client's offending, and the nature of supervision as a sanction, is as fictional as the normalisation of unpaid work clients.

The findings with regard to unpaid work present a fascinating contribution to community service discourse: the client's own experience of 'contribution', and how that reframes existing theory and research. Discussion concerning the symbolic significance of unpaid work is instead inverted: the focus from the client's performance to a public audience replaced with the public's (unwitting) performance to the client-as-worker through their engagement with the work's results. Many of the benefits noted by McIvor's [1992] research into positive client perception, for instance, can be achieved through this sense of contribution without the same direct public interaction - indeed, such positive perception may arguably be advanced by these findings by incorporating an element of normative self-development [cf. McIvor, 2010]. Such a perceptual stance may, on the one hand, suggest that it is possible to move away from a reparative stance, and the implicit association of wrongdoing-induced debt [Weaver and Armstrong, 2011]. On

the other hand, however, the unpaid work case study may arguably serve as a demonstration of why that association is so crucial. Without that sense of debt repaid [Pamment and Ellis, 2010], past deeds undone [Weaver and Armstrong, 2011], or 'making good' achieved [Maruna, 2011] a reciprocal effort by beneficiaries to support clients (notably absent in these findings) is altogether less certain. While the findings of this research suggest that the client's perception does not rely on an audience, it only serves to emphasise the necessity of that audience, and how in turn they perceive the client, to achieve the same social linkages valued in McIvor's [1992] research.

Chapter 13 - Conclusion: The Social Realities of the CPO

Over the course of this thesis, observations from frontline practice in the CPO's supervision and unpaid work requirements have been explored both on their own terms and in contrast and comparison with wider theory, research and policy. What then can be said in summation with regards to this thesis' central effort: to develop an understanding of the CPO's social realities in practice?

From a policy perspective, perhaps the most immediate answer is to say 'not as advertised' - with numerous attendant advancements and challenges to established literature, as already detailed in the prior two chapters. While the nature of CPO policy is deeper and more complex than it gives as its own initial impression, nevertheless there is a clear characterisation of the CPO as both its public identity and core idea. That characterisation sets the CPO as a punishment/supportive intervention hybrid, focussed on the offender client providing payback to an abstract community, whether that be through the improved safety of their own rehabilitation and reintegration, the provision of reparative unpaid work, or a combination thereof and other, more ancillary, requirements.

As has been demonstrated, however, this envisaged social reality had little in common with the social reality created in practice by stakeholder interactions. The CPO as observed in this research was - for better and sometimes for worse - decidedly not a punishment; the extent to which it acted, let alone succeeded, as a supportive intervention varied between the two requirements, but as a defining perception for those who framed and pre-constructed their social realities (supervisors and beneficiaries both), this particular facet was beyond contestation. Even clients, the most keenly aware of the CPO's obligations and sanctions, predominantly overcame the CPO's inherent penal qualities to engage with it as an effort to provide them support (or, in the case of unpaid work, a benevolent not-exactly-voluntary service).

In neither requirement's social reality was 'community' the ultimate beneficiary of the interaction and its efforts: supervision placed the client as both the central driver and subject of its change work, with client aspiration and self-interest providing motivation and information to define both interaction and subsequent social reality; unpaid work, meanwhile, was conducted covertly amidst the public, with beneficiaries reaping the most tangible benefit of clients' services, whilst clients synergised with engaging tasks to build their own sense of self into something more positive. 'Community' was, instead, a more complex idea in both sets of social realities. In supervision, it served as the greatest antagonist of clients' lives and efforts to desist, representing not only their criminogenic backgrounds, but the existing toxic environment that both hindered positive progress and undermined client motivation and engagement with agency-limiting recidivist pressure. On the other hand, however, community-as-personal-network demonstrated a consistently powerful motivation and aspiration for clients - bonds of parenthood, whether as parent or child, were often at the source of clients' strongest drives and most positive self-perceptions. In unpaid work, 'community' was oft overlooked by beneficiaries, who did not realise the potential power they held for a client as a new social link in self-same personal network. But from this lack of awareness arose a spectacular effort on clients' own part to form their own mutually supportive network with each other: a crowd-sourced hub of advice, encouragement and solidarity with its roots in the shared sweat and exertion of unpaid work tasks, and the catalysing bonds that formed as a result.

Likewise, neither requirement placed the idea of 'payback' as central to its interactions. Supervision's individualised nature was incompatible within with the idea of rehabilitation as a service rendered for another, external party's benefit (although, as with public protection, that does not mean 'the community' would not so benefit). Unpaid work, on the other hand, was more complex: without a clear reparative symbolism to its social realities, the very purpose (and, by consequence, potentially positive rewards) of unpaid work

were obfuscated, leaving the requirement fluttering with little direction; on the other hand, the sense of positive contribution generated by clients own efforts and perceptions created the most defining aspect of many social realities within the requirement.

To say that the social realities of these case studies were collaboratively generated by stakeholder interactions, both supervisor-client and client-beneficiary, would be correct but not entirely accurate. Yes, undoubtedly both supervision and unpaid work demonstrated an impressive intermingling of stakeholders' perceptions, which combined through explicitly and implicitly negotiated responses, interactive steps, contextualisation, relevancy and repertoires to produce consequent social realities that were shaped and defined by both sets of progenitor perceptions. But that is, at most, only half the image, and overlooks the complex strata of spaces that existed within such interactions and their realities.

At the heart of the CPO, equally applicable to both requirements, was the client. More than just an object to be worked upon (or, in unpaid work, simply to be worked), the client was undeniably the subject of both requirements, their interactions and realities. In both requirements client perceptions drove interactions - their engagement with either their supervisor or the particular unpaid work assignment came to define the nature of the CPO in that regard. A client who developed a positive rapport with their supervisor - sharing information, pursuing a vision of their desired future, and addressing problems both immediate and underlying - produced and in turn experienced a markedly different reality from a client who did not engage. Clients who responded to unpaid work tasks with investment rather than cynicism developed banter, morale and eventually the payoff of seeing their work enjoyed by the public.

But client engagement was more than simply a feature of the CPO's social realities. It was, arguably, its *raison d'être*. The importance of clients' perceptions translating, through their actions, into a deliberately defined reality was essential to the vision of agency demonstrated within both

requirements. In supervision, this vision was explicit: a purposive effort on the part of the supervisor to help the client build themselves into a self-determining actor, able to envisage and pursue their own positive desires in the face of criminogenic influences and hostile contexts. Unpaid work was more implicit and subtle (and, arguably, not deliberate), but its instances of success occurred where clients chose to take ownership over an assigned task, invest it with effort, and in doing so progress alongside the task as its contributor. In both instances, the best social realities were produced when clients were engaged in conscious choice, aware of their own selves (their norms, challenges, assets and ambitions) and acting based on informed reflection to pursue something defined, deliberate and desired.

However, this presents a paradox. For in both requirements, this agency was a product of circumstances, determined by the contexts in which clients found themselves. This is where the idea of the collaborative, co-produced realities becomes more complex, for while both supervisors and beneficiaries existed in a supplementary role to this client-driven process - providing support or encouragement - they also exerted a greater influence on their interactions with clients, and thus their consequent realities. Neither supervision nor unpaid work occurred *ex nihilo*; both occurred in pre-existing contexts. At the most basic level, this context could be said to be the CPO as a penal sanction, bearing with it a range of obligations and sanctions which had to be enforced, thus endowing supervisors and beneficiaries with powers that clients lacked. The ability (and, in the eyes of supervisors, unfortunate necessity) to initiate breach proceedings, or conditions of behaviour imposed on unpaid work sites, were both rarely invoked, and did little to tarnish positive instances of stakeholder interactions, but they nevertheless existed on a permanently pervasive sub-strata of both requirements' social realities as an indelible fact.

But this is not the full extent of supervisors'/beneficiaries' contextual influence. In both instances, client agency was a deliberate part of a pre-determined framework. Supervisors explicitly encouraged and sought to

foster client agency as part of their support efforts to help clients realise their own vision of desistance. Beneficiaries set forth work agendas with whose practical parameters clients would either engage or not. In both instances, these frameworks were reliant on client engagement, but that does not mean they did not exert a similar measure of power over interactions that clients lacked (and, indeed, one much more subtle than the CPO's explicit conditions). This power was most demonstrable in instances where clients were not engaged. In supervision, supervisors would continue to render whatever minimal, practical assistance they could to the client (often through self-acknowledged pestering 'nuisance'), whilst continuously endeavouring to foster the rapport through which client engagement would be achieved. Clients were free not to engage, but that did not stop supervisors trying, and even in instances of engagement, the repertoire of 'responsibility' served as an overriding leverage of the relationship underpinning supervisor/client interaction to achieve a supervisor-desired outcome. In unpaid work, even if clients did not engage with a particular task, the imperative to conduct the task gave rise to the social reality facet of 'graft' - a disjunctive reality, wherein the mindless, self-automated clients perceived little other than the benefit of hours-reduction, while beneficiaries perceived a valuable service being rendered.

Yet, perhaps, it may be said that the most defining quality of the CPO's social realities was their limits, and therefore by extension their limitations. Both requirements had clear borders, whether imposed by stakeholders or external circumstances, beyond which interaction was unable to alter contextual facts. For supervision, this was the spectre of a client's community, and its influences, challenges and restrictions upon said client's agency. While supervision interactions could co-produce social realities where clients were motivated, focussed on clear goals, and even (whether through discussion or specialist services) possessing of skills to tackle personal problems and take practical steps towards desistance, everything changed upon leaving the physical boundaries of said interactions. Client

motivation was complicated by pressing concerns and emergent issues, clear goals became muddled by the environmental pressures of their neighbourhood, and no amount of skills could fully or realistically support clients facing an absence of jobs, a tightening of welfare and the tapestry of anti-social norms into which their lives were woven.

For unpaid work, the limitation was stakeholder-made, but no less profound in its limitations for interactions. In an unfortunate, ironic turn, these limitations seemed made with the best unconscious intentions: to welcome clients onto worksites as ordinary citizens, perceiving and treating them as no different from other volunteers that provided their services to beneficiary organisations. But as has been noted repeatedly, such a fiction glossed over the one indelible fact of the CPO - its status as a penal sanction - and in doing so beneficiaries limited both their perception of, and clients' potential capacity to express, the challenges, needs and (more often than not) frustrated aspirations that underpinned their prior offending. Where clients were able to penetrate this limitation, such successes were not through a social reality of beneficiaries recognising someone in need of support to achieve desistance, but a fortunate alignment of those frustrated aspirations with organisational agenda. By being normalised as any other kind of on-site work, albeit with several subtle conditions attached to it, unpaid work was stripped of its capacity for both symbolic and practical change, and by extension its capacity to meaningfully impact clients' lives in a long-term capacity.

What this sense of limitation produced in both requirements, and by extension the observed CPO's practical operations in general, was an unfortunate 'bubbling' or 'pocketing' of its social realities. To borrow a concept from science fiction, a bubble or pocket reality is a microcosm separate from, but remaining attached to, a wider universe of existence. Typically artificial, those within are beholden to its self-contained ecosystem, but only for so long as they remain within.

Much the same can be seen with the social realities of the CPO: in

both supervision and unpaid work, interactions between the stakeholders were able to form co-productive, often optimistic social realities wherein clients were able to forge tentative, nascent new self-identities, receiving support (whether practical or symbolic) to nurture this new vision and plan out how to realise it in the wider societal universe. However, upon emerging from this social bubble/pocket into the societal universe, the conditions wherein their interactions took place were replaced by something altogether more hostile, or at the very least profoundly unreceptive/indifferent. Communities limited client agency, not only impeding forward progress but mirroring clients in the same criminogenic pressures that gave rise to their prior offending; unpaid work beneficiaries failed to recognise the power they possessed to make a difference for clients, and thus their sum contribution was largely indifferent.

While, of course, it must be stated one last time that this research is the product of non-representative case studies, and thus any wider claims should be treated with the utmost caution, such studies nevertheless allow for ideas and lessons to be transferred from like cases to like. This thesis has explored perceptions and interactions that are arguably worth supporting and pursuing, others that are potentially problematic, and as a result provided the desired insight into at least one small corner of the CPO's day-to-day practice. But in doing so, I believe it has touched upon a vital lesson that must, always, be taken forward: the great criminological enterprise of somehow 'solving' crime cannot be relegated to two individuals talking in a social worker's office, or a group of half-dozen offender clients labouring in a park. If, as we are increasingly coming to recognise, crime is a societal product, then so too must the solution, the response, be societal. The change catalyst, the plan, and even the first meaningful steps may come from a client working alongside their supervision, a beneficiary of their work, or even a fellow client, but unless we count on the good fortune of numerous, macroscopic societal factors aligning in that client's favour, we must instead look to how our entire society interacts with offenders. To how our

perceptions, actions and interactions produce a greater reality, and how we as a whole can, ourselves, change.

Bibliography

Acosta, J. and D. Chavis [2007] Build the Capacity of Communities to Address Crime, *Criminology and Public Policy* 6(4): 651-61

Adler, P.A. and P. Adler [1987] Membership Roles in Field Research, London: Sage

Allen, R. [2008] Changing Public Attitudes to Crime and Punishment – Building Confidence in Community Penalties, *Probation Journal* 55(): 389-400

Allen, R. and M. Hough [2007] Community Penalties, Sentencers, the Media and Public Opinion. In L. Gelsthorpe and R. Morgan (eds), *Handbook of Probation*, Cullompton: Willan

Anderson, S. [2016] The Value of 'Bearing Witness' to Desistance, *Probation Journal* 63(4): 408-424

Anderson, S., S. Hinchliffe, A. Homes, S. McConville, A. Wild, N. Hutton and S. Noble [2015] Evaluation of Community Payback Orders, Criminal Justice Social Work Reports and the Presumption Against Short Sentences, Edinburgh: Scottish Government Social Research

Annison, J., T. Eadie and C. Knight [2008] People First: Probation Officer Perspectives on Probation Work, *Probation Journal* 55(3): 259-271

Arksey, H. and P. Knight [1999] Interviewing for Social Scientists, London: Sage

Armstrong, S. and B. Weaver [2010] What do the Punished Think of

Punishment? The Comparative Experience of Short Prison Sentences and Community-Based Punishment, SCCJR Research Report No.04/2010

Atkinson, P. [1990] *The Ethnographic Imagination: Textual Constructions of Reality*, London: Routledge

Barry, M. [2000] The Mentor/Monitor Debate in Criminal Justice: What Works for Offenders, *British Journal of Social Work* 30(5): 575-95

Bazemore, G. and R. Boba [2007] "Doing Good" to "Make Good": Community Theory for Practice in a Restorative Justice Civic Engagement Reentry Model, *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation* 46(1): 25-56

Bazemore, G. and D. Maloney [1994] Rehabilitating Community Service: Towards Restorative Service Sanctions in a Balanced Justice System, *Federal Probation* 58(1): 24-35

Becker, H. [1963] *Outsiders: Studies in the Sociology of Deviance*, New York: The Free Press

Berg, B.L. [2007] *Qualitative Research Methods for the Social Sciences* (6th Edition), London: Allyn and Bacon

Biestek, F.P. [1961] *The Casework Relationship*, London: Allen & Unwin

Blaikie, N.W.H. [2000] *Designing Social Research: The Logic of Anticipation*, Malden MA: Polity Press

Bonta, J. and D.A. Andrews [2010] Viewing Offender Assessment Through the Lens of the Risk-Need-Responsivity Model. In F. McNeill, P. Raynor and C. Trotter (eds), *Offender Supervision: New Directions in Theory, Research*

and Practice, Abingdon: Willan

Bonta, J., T. Rugge, T.L. Scott, G. Bourgon and A.K. Yessine [2008] Exploring the Black Box of Community Supervision, *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation* 47(3): 248-270

Booth, W.C., G.G. Colomb and J.M. Williams [2008] The Craft of Research (3rd Edition), Chicago: University of Chicago Press

Bottoms, A.E. [2001] Compliance with Community Penalties. In A.E. Bottoms, L. Gelsthorpe and S. Rex (eds), *Community Penalties: Change and Challenges*, Cullompton: Willan

– [2008] The Community Dimension of Community Penalties, *Howard Journal* 47(2): 146-169

Bottoms, A.E. and W. McWilliams [1979] A Non-Treatment Paradigm for Probation Practice, *British Journal of Social Work* 9(2): 160-201

Boyatzis, R.E. [1998] *Transforming Qualitative Information: Thematic Analysis and Code Development*, London: Sage

Braithwaite, J. [1989] *Crime, Shame and Reintegration*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Braithwaite, V.A. [2003] *Taxing Democracy: Understanding Tax Avoidance and Evasion*, Aldershot: Ashgate

Brownlee, I. [1998] *Community Punishment: A Critical Introduction*, Harlow: Longman

- Bryman, A. [2012] *Social Research Methods*, Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Burke, L. and S. Collett [2010] People are not Things: What New Labour has Done to Probation, *Probation Journal* 57(3): 232-249
- Burnett, R. [1992] *The Dynamics of Recidivism*, Oxford: Centre for Criminological Research
- Burnett, R., K. Baker and C. Roberts [2007] Assessment, Supervision and Intervention: Fundamental Practice in Probation. In L. Gelsthorpe and R. Morgan (eds), *Handbook of Probation*, Cullompton: Willan
- Burnett, R. and F. McNeill [2005] The Place of the Officer-Offender Relationship in Assisting Offenders to Desist from Crime, *Probation Journal* 52(3): 221-242
- Butter, R., J. Hermanns and A. Menger [2013] Simultaneous Prediction of Punitive and Rehabilitation-Oriented Attitudes Towards Probation: An Ecological Approach, *Probation Journal* 60(1): 24-39
- Canton, R. [2012] The Point of Probation: On Effectiveness, Human Rights and the Virtues of Obliquity, *Criminology and Criminal Justice* 13(5): 577-593
- Casey, L. [2008] *Engaging Communities in Fighting Crime*, London: Cabinet Office
- Chamberlain, J.M. [2013] *Understanding Criminological Research: A Guide to Data Analysis*, London: Sage
- Clear, T.R. [2005] Places not Cases?: Re-Thinking the Probation Focus, *Howard Journal* 44(2): 172-184

Coffey, A. and P. Atkinson [1996] *Making Sense of Qualitative Data*, London: Sage

Cohen, S. [1985] *Visions of Social Control*, Cambridge: Polity Press

Cosgrove, F. and P. Francis [2011] *Ethnographic Research in the Context of Policing*. In P. Davies, P. Francis and V. Jupp (eds), *Doing Criminological Research*, London: Sage

Creswell, J.W. [2007] *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design* (2nd Edition), London: Sage

Cross, D. [2017] A Human Rights-Based Approach to Community Justice: Adding Value to Desistance Focused Practice, *European Journal of Probation* 9(2): 149-168

Crow, I. and N. Semmens [2008] *Researching Criminology*, New York: Open University Press

Davies, M. [1969] *Probationers in the Social Environment*, Home Office Research Unit Report, London: HMSO

– [2011] *Formulating Criminological Research Questions*. In P. Davies, P. Francis and V. Jupp (eds), *Doing Criminological Research*, London: Sage

Day, A. [2011] Offender Rehabilitation: Current Problems and Ethically Informed Approaches to Intervention, *Ethics and Social Welfare* 5(4): 348-360

Day, A., L. Hardcastle and A. Birgden [2012] *Case Management in*

Community Corrections: Current Status and Future Directions, *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation* 51(7): 484-495

Day, A., T. Ward and L. Shirley [2011] Reintegration Services for Long-Term Dangerous Offenders: A Case Study and Discussion, *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation* 50(2): 66-80

Deering, J. [2011] Probation Practice and the New Penology, Farnham: Ashgate

– [2014] A Future for Probation?, *Howard Journal* 53(1): 1-15

Denscombe, M. [2002] Ground Rules for Good Research: A 10 Point Guide for Social Researchers, Buckingham: Open University

Denzin, N.K. [2000] Symbolic Interactionism. In U. Flick, E. Kardorff and I. Steinke (eds), *A Companion to Qualitative Research*, London: Sage

Drake, D.H. and A.J. Henley [2014] 'Victims' Versus 'Offenders' in British Political Discourse: The Construction of a False Dichotomy, *Howard Journal* 53(2): 141-157

Denzin, N.K. and Y.S. Lincoln [2000] *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, London: Sage

Duff, R.A. [2003a] Penance, Punishment and the Limits of Community, *Punishment and Society* 5(3): 295-312

– [2003b] Probation, Punishment and Restorative Justice: Should AI Turism Be Engaged in Punishment?, *Howard Journal* 42(2): 181-197

Durnescu, I. [2012] What Matters Most in Probation Supervision: Staff Characteristics, Staff Skills or Programme?, *Criminology and Criminal Justice* 12(2): 193-216

Emerson, R., R. Fretz and L. Shaw [2011] Writing Ethnographic Fieldnotes, Chicago: University of Chicago Press

Farrall, S. [2002] Rethinking What Works with Offenders: Probation, Social Context and Desistance from Crime, Collumpton: Willan

Fenton, J. [2013] Risk Aversion and Anxiety in Scottish Criminal Justice Social Work: Can Desistance and Human Rights Agendas Have an Impact?, *Howard Journal* 52(1): 77-90

Fitzgibbon, D.W.M. [2007] Risk Analysis and the New Practitioner, *Punishment and Society* 9(1): 87-97

Fitzgibbon, W. and J.N. Lea [2010] Police, Probation and the Bifurcation of Community, *Howard Journal* 49(3): 215-230

Foster, J., T. Newburn and A. Souhami [2005] Assessing the Impact of the Stephen Lawrence Inquiry on Policing in England and Wales, London: Home Office

Foucault, M. [1979] Discipline and Punish, Harmondsworth: Penguin

Fox, K. [2016] Civic Commitment: Promoting Desistance Through Community Integration, *Punishment and Society* 18(1): 68-94

Fox, C. and C. Marsh [2016] Operationalising Desistance Through Personalisation, *European Journal of Probation* 8(3): 185-206

Frayne, D. [1993] The History of Change. In D. Whitfield and D. Scott (eds), *Paying Back: Twenty Years of Community Service*, Winchester: Waterside

Freiberg, A. [2001] Affective Versus Effective Justice: Instrumentalism and Emotionalism in Criminal Justice, *Punishment and Society* 3(2): 265-278

Gadd, D. [2012] In-Depth Interviewing and Psychosocial Case Study Analysis. In D. Gadd, S. Karstedt and S.F. Messner (eds), *The SAGE Handbook of Criminological Research Methods*, London: Sage

Garfinkel, H. [2006] Seeing Sociologically: The Routine Grounds of Social Action, London: Paradigm

Garland, D. [1990] *Punishment and Modern Society*, Oxford: Clarendon

George, A.L. and A. Bennett [2004] *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*, London: MIT Press

Gilbert, G.N. [2008] *Researching Social Life*, Los Angeles, CA: Sage

Giordano, P., S. Cernkovich and J. Rudolph [2002] Gender, Crime and Desistance: Toward a Theory of Cognitive Transformation, *American Journal of Sociology* 107(4): 990-1064

Goffman, E. [1970] *Strategic Interaction*, Oxford: Blackwell

Gomm, R. [2012] *Social Research Methodology: A Critical Introduction*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan

Graham, H. [2016] *Rehabilitation Work: Supporting Desistance and*

Recovery, London: Routledge

Grant, S. and F. McNeill [2015] What Matters in Practice? Understanding 'Quality' in the Routine Supervision of Offenders in Scotland, *British Journal of Social Work*, 45(7): 1985-2002

Gray, P. [2005] The Politics of Risk and Young Offenders' Experiences of Social Exclusion and Restorative Justice, *British Journal of Criminology* 45(6): 938-57

Gray, G.C. and A.T. Salole [2006] The Local Culture of Punishment: An Ethnography of Criminal Justice Worker Discourse, *British Journal of Criminology* 46(4): 661-679

Green, D.A. [2006] Public Opinion Versus Public Judgement About Crime: Correcting the Comedy of Errors, *British Journal of Criminology* 46(1): 131-154

Grounds, A. [1995] Risk Assessment and Management in Clinical Context. In J. Crichton (ed) *Psychiatric Patient Violence: Risk and Relapse*, London: Duckworth

Gumperz, J.J. and D.H. Hymes [1972] *Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication*, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston

Hammersley, M. and P. Atkinson [1983] *Ethnography: Principles in Practice*, London: Routledge

Harding, J. [2000] A Community Justice Dimension to Effective Probation Practice, *Howard Journal* 39(2): 132-149

– [2003] Which Way Probation? A Correctional or Community Justice Service?, *Probation Journal* 50(4): 369-373

Harrison, K. [2006] Community Punishment or Community Rehabilitation: Which is the Highest in the Sentencing Tariff?, *Howard Journal* 45(2): 141-158

Hayes, D. [2015] The Impact of Supervision on the Pains of Community Penalties in England and Wales: An Exploratory Study, *European Journal of Probation* 7(2): 85-102

Healy, D. and I. O'Donnell [2008] Calling Time on Crime: Motivation, Generativity and Agency in Irish Probationers, *Probation Journal* 55(1): 25-38

Hedderman, C., and M. Hough [2004] Getting Tough or Being Effective: What Matters?. In G. Mair (ed), *What Matters in Probation*, Cullompton: Devon

Hewitt, J.P. [2003] Symbols, Objects and Meanings. In L.T. Reynolds and N.J. Herman (eds), *Handbook of Symbolic Interactionism*, Oxford: AltaMira Press

Heyl, B. [2001] Ethnographic Interviewing. In P. Atkinson, A. Coffey, S. Delamont, J. Lofland and L. Lofland (eds), *Handbook of Ethnography*, London: Sage

Hignett, C. [2000] 'Punish and Rehabilitate' – Do They Mean Us?, *Probation Journal* 47(1): 51-52

Hutton, N. [2005] Beyond Populist Punitiveness?, *Punishment and Society* 7(3): 243-258

Indermaur, D., L. Roberts, C. Spiranovic, G. Mackenzie and K. Gelb [2012] A Matter of Judgement: The Effect of Information and Deliberation on Public Attitudes to Punishment, *Punishment and Society* 14(2): 147-165

Jones, S. [2004] Depth Interviewing. In C. Seale (ed), *Social Research Methods: A Reader*, London: Routledge

Jones, T. and T. Newburn [2006] Three Strikes and You're Out: Exploring Symbol and Substance in American and British Crime Control Politics, *British Journal of Criminology* 46(5): 781-802

Kemshall, H. [2010] The Role of Risk, Needs and Strengths Assessment in Improving the Supervision of Offenders. In F. McNeill, P. Raynor and C. Trotter (eds), *Offender Supervision: New Directions in Theory, Research and Practice*, Abingdon: Willan

Kendall, K. [2004] Dangerous Thinking: A Critical History of Correctional Cognitive Behaviouralism. In G. Mair (ed), *What Matters in Probation*, Cullompton: Devon

Kilcommins, S. [2014] The Introduction of Community Service Orders: Mapping its 'Conditions of Possibility', *Howard Journal* 53(5): 487-510

King, J. [1958] *The Probation Service*, London: Butterworths

King, S. [2012] Transformative Agency and Desistance from Crime, *Criminology and Criminal Justice* 13(3): 317-335

– [2013] Assisted Desistance and Experiences of Probation Supervision, *Probation Journal* 60(2): 136-151

Kirkwood, S. [2016] Desistance in Action: An Interactional Approach to Criminal Justice Practice and Desistance from Offending, *Theoretical Criminology* 20(2): 220-237

Kirkwood, S. and M. Munro [2017] Warm Words but no Action, *Scottish Justice Matters* 5(1): 2-3

Koenig, J. [2017] The Dictionary of Obscure Sorrows, www.dictionaryofobscuresorrows.com

Kvale, S. [1996] InterViews: An Introduction to Qualitative Research Interviewing, London: Sage

Lacey, N. and L. Zedner [1995] Discourses of Community in Criminal Justice, *Journal of Law and Society* 22(3): 301-325

Landau, T. [2004] How to Put the Community in Community-Based Justice: Some Views of Participants in Criminal Court Diversion, *Howard Journal* 43(2): 131-148

LeBel, P., R. Burnett, S. Maruna and S. Bushway [2008] The 'Chicken and Egg' of Subjective and Social Factors in Desistance from Crime, *European Journal of Criminology* 5(2): 131-159

Lemert, C.C. and A. Branaman [1997] The Goffman Reader, Oxford: Blackwell

Lewis, S. [2014] Learning from Success and Failure: Deconstructing the Working Relationship within Probation Practice and Exploring its Impact on Probationers, using a Collaborative Approach, *Probation Journal* 61(2): 161-175

Lofland, J. and L.H. Lofland [1995] *Analysing Social Settings: A Guide to Qualitative Observation and Analysis*, London: Wadsworth

Lynch, M. [2000] Rehabilitation as Rhetoric: The Ideal of Reformation in Contemporary Parole Discourse and Practices, *Punishment and Society* 2(1): 40-65

Maguise, M., P. Raynor, M. Vanstone and J. Kynchy [1998] *Voluntary After-Care*, Home Office Research Findings No. 73, London: Home Office

Mair, G. and R. Canton [2007] Sentencing, Community Penalties and the Role of the Probation Service. In L. Gelsthorpe and R. Morgan (eds), *Handbook of Probation*, Cullompton: Willan

Manning, P.K. [2001] Semiotics, Semantics and Ethnography. In P. Atkinson, A. Coffey, S. Delamont, J. Lofland and L. Lofland (eds), *Handbook of Ethnography*, London: Sage

Mantle, G. and S. Moore [2004] On Probation: Pickled and Nothing to Say, *Howard Journal* 43(3): 299-316

Maruna, S. [2001] *Making Good: How Ex-Convicts Reform and Rebuild Their Lives*, Washington, DC: American Psychological Association

– [2011] Reentry as a Rite of Passage, *Punishment and Society* 13(1): 3-28

Maruna, S. and A. King [2004] Public Opinion and Community Penalties. In A.E. Bottoms, S. Rex and G. Robinson (eds), *Alternatives to Prison*, Cullompton: Willan

– [2008] Selling the Public on Probation: Beyond the Bib, *Probation Journal* 55(4): 337-351

Maruna, S. and T. LeBel [2003] Welcome Home? Examining the 'Re-Entry Court' Concept from a Strengths-Based Perspective, *Western Criminology Review* 4(2): 91-107

Mason, J. [2002] *Qualitative Researching*, London: Sage

Maxwell, J.A. [2012] *Qualitative Research Design: An Interactive Approach*, London: Sage

Maxwell, G. and A. Morris [2001] Putting Restorative Justice into Practice for Adult Offenders, *Howard Journal* 40(1): 55-69

Maynard, D. [1989] On the Ethnography and Analysis of Discourse in Institutional Settings. In J. Holstein and G. Miller (eds), *Perspective in Social Problems*, vol. 1, Greenwich, CT: JAI Press

Maynard, D.W. and S.E. Clayman [2003] Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis. In L.T. Reynolds and N.J. Herman (eds), *Handbook of Symbolic Interactionism*, Oxford: AltaMira

McCall, G.J. [2003] Interaction. In L.T. Reynolds and N.J. Herman (eds), *Handbook of Symbolic Interactionism*, Oxford: AltaMira

McCulloch, T. [2005] Probation, Social Context and Desistance: Retracing the Relationship, *Probation Journal* 52(1): 8-22

– [2015] Beyond Compliance: Participation, Co-Production and Change in Justice Sanctions, *European Journal of Probation* 7(1): 40-57

McGuinness, P. [2014] Room for Reparation? An Ethnographic Study into the Implementation of the Community Payback Order in a Scottish Criminal Justice Social Work Office. University of Glasgow: PhD Thesis

Mclvor, G. [1992] Sentenced to Serve, Aldershot: Avebury

– [1998] Prosocial Modeling and Legitimacy: Lessons from a Study of Community Service. In A. Matravers and S. Rex (eds), Prosocial Modeling and Legitimacy: The Clarke Hall Day Conference, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

– [2004] Reparative and Restorative Approaches. In A.E. Bottoms, S. Rex and G. Robinson (eds), Alternatives to Prison, Cullompton: Willan

– [2010] Paying Back: 30 Years of Unpaid Work by Offenders in Scotland, *European Journal of Probation* 2(1): 41-61

– [2016] What is the Impact of Community Service? In F. McNeill, I. Durnescu and R. Butter (eds), Probation: 12 Essential Questions, London: Palgrave Macmillan

Mclvor, G. and M. Barry [1998] Social Work and Criminal Justice: Volume 6 Probation, Edinburgh: The Scottish Office Central Research Unit

McNeill, F. [1998] Effective Probation - Workers' Perspectives on its Definition, Delivery and Development'. Unpublished MSc Dissertation, Universities of Stirling and Edinburgh

– [2004] Supporting Desistance in Probation Practice: A Response to Maruna, Porte and Carvalho, *Probation Journal* 51(3): 241-247

- [2006] A Desistance Paradigm for Offender Management, *Criminology and Criminal Justice* 6(1): 39-62

- [2009a] Probation, Rehabilitation and Reparation, *Irish Probation Journal* 6(1): 5-22

- [2009b] Towards Effective Practice in Offender Supervision, SCCJR Report 01/09

- [2010] Community Payback and the New National Standards for Criminal Justice Social Work, SCCJR Briefing Paper No. 02/2010

- [2011] Probation, Credibility and Justice, *Probation Journal* 58(1): 9-22

- [2012] Four Forms of 'Offender' Rehabilitation: Towards an Interdisciplinary Perspective, *Legal and Criminological Psychology* 17(1): 18-36

- [2013] Changing Lives, Changing Work: Social Work and Criminal Justice. In I. Durnescu and F. McNeill (eds), *Understanding Penal Practice*

- [2014] How Best to Stop Offenders Reoffending and Reintegrate Them Into Civil Society, Preparatory Paper for the University of Sheffield Centre for Criminological Research Seminar Series on 'Coping with Crime: Citizens and Government', British Academy: London

McNeill, F., S. Batchelor, R. Burnett & J. Knox (2005) *21st Century Social Work - Reducing Reoffending: Key Practice Skills*, Edinburgh: Scottish Executive

McNeill, F., I. Durnescu, R. Butter (2016) *Probation: 12 Essential Questions*,

London: Palgrave Macmillan

McNeill, F. and S. Maruna [2008] Giving Up and Giving Back: Desistance, Generativity and Social Work with Offenders. In G. McIvor and P. Raynor (eds) *Developments in Social Work with Offenders*, London: Jessica Kingsley

McNeill, F. and B. Weaver [2010] *Changing Lives? Desistance Research and Offender Management*, SCCJR Report No.03/2010

McNeill, F. and B. Whyte [2007] *Reducing Reoffending: Social Work and Community Justice in Scotland*, Cullompton: Willan

Morris, A. [1993] Introduction. In D. Whitfield and D. Scott (eds), *Paying Back: Twenty Years of Community Service*, Winchester: Waterside

– [2002] Critiquing the Critics: A Brief Response to Critics of Restorative Justice, *British Journal of Criminology* 42(3): 596-615

Muncie, J. [2011] Labelling, Social Reaction and Social Constructionism. In E. McLaughlin and T. Newburn, *SAGE Handbook of Criminological Theory*, London: Sage

Murphy, E. and R. Dingwall [2001] The Ethics of Ethnography. In P. Atkinson, A. Coffey, S. Delamont, J. Lofland and L. Lofland (eds), *Handbook of Ethnography*, London: Sage

National Probation Directorate [2003] *Careers in the National Probation Service*

Nellis, M. [2001] Community Penalties in Historical Perspective. In A.E. Bottoms, L. Gelsthorpe and S. Rex (eds), *Community Penalties: Change and*

Challenges, Cullompton: Willan

Noaks, L. and E. Wincup [2004] *Criminological Research: Understanding Qualitative Methods*, London: Sage

Nunan, [1993] *Introducing Discourse Analysis*, London: Penguin English

Oldfield, M. [1993] *Assessing the Impact of Community Service – Lost Opportunities and the Politics of Punishment*. In D. Whitfield and D. Scott (eds), *Paying Back: Twenty Years of Community Service*, Winchester: Waterside

O’Leary, Z. [2004] *The Essential Guide to Doing Research*, London: Sage

Oliver, P. [2003] *The Student’s Guide to Research Ethics*, Maidenhead: Open University Press

Pamment, N. and T. Ellis [2010] *A Retrograde Step: The Potential Impact of High Visibility Uniforms Within Youth Justice Reparation*, *Howard Journal* 49(1): 18-30

Partridge, S. [2004] *Examining Case Management Models for Sentences*, Home Office Online Report

Paternoster, R. and S. Bushway [2009] *Desistance and the 'Feared Self': Toward an Identity Theory of Criminal Desistance*, *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology* 99(4): 1103-1156

Patton, M.Q. [2002] *Qualitative Evaluation and Research Methods*, London: Sage

Porporino, F.J. and E. Fabiano [2008] Case Managing Offenders within a Motivational Framework. In G. McIvor and P. Raynor (eds), *Developments in Social Work with Offenders*, London: Jessica Kingsley

Potter, J. [2009] Discourse Analysis. In M.A. Hardy and A. Bryman, *Handbook of Data Analysis*, London: Sage

Pratt, J. [2007] *Penal Populism*, London: Routledge

Punch, K. [1998] *Introduction to Social Research: Quantitative & Qualitative Approaches*, London: Sage

Raynor, P. [2001] Community Penalties and Social Integration: 'Community' as Solution and as Problem. In A.E. Bottoms, L. Gelsthorpe and S. Rex (eds), *Community Penalties: Change and Challenges*, Cullompton: Willan

Rex, S. [1998] *Perceptions of Probation in a Context of 'Just Deserts'*, Unpublished PhD thesis, Cambridge: University of Cambridge

– [1999] Desistance from Offending: Experiences of Probation, *Howard Journal* 36(4): 366-83

– [2002] Reinventing Community Penalties: The Role of Communication. In S. Rex and M. Tonry (eds), *Reform and Punishment: The Future of Sentencing*, Cullompton: Willan

– [2004] Punishment as Communication. In A.E. Bottoms, S. Rex and G. Robinson (eds), *Alternatives to Prison*, Cullompton: Willan

Roberts, J.V. and M. Hough [2011] Custody or Community? Exploring the Boundaries of Public Punitiveness in England and Wales, *Criminology and*

Criminal Justice 11(2): 181-197

Rex, S. and L. Gelsthorpe [2002] The Role of Community Service in Reducing Offending: Evaluating Pathfinder Projects in the UK, *Howard Journal* 41(4): 311-325

Robinson, G. [2005] What Works in Offender Management, *Howard Journal* 44(3): 307-318

– [2008] Late-Modern Rehabilitation, *Punishment and Society* 10(4): 429-445

Robinson, G. and F. McNeill [2008] Exploring the Dynamics of Compliance with Community Penalties, *Theoretical Criminology* 12(4): 431-449

– [2017] Punishment in the Community: Evolution, Expansion and Moderation. In A. Liebling, S. Maruna and L. McAra (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Criminology* (6th Ed), Oxford University Press, Oxford

Robinson G., C. Priede, S. Farrall, J. Shapland and F. McNeill [2014] Understanding ‘Quality’ in Probation Practice: Frontline Perspectives in England and Wales, *Criminology and Criminal Justice* 14(2): 123-142

Robinson, G. and J. Shapland [2008] Reducing Recidivism: A Task for Restorative Justice?, *British Journal of Criminology* 48(3): 337-358

Robinson, G. and P. Ugwuodike [2012] Investing in ‘Toughness’: Probation, Enforcement and Legitimacy, *Howard Journal* 51(3): 300-316

Robson, C. [2011] *Real World Research*, Chichester: Wiley

Rock, P. [2001] Symbolic Interactionism and Ethnography. In P. Atkinson, A.

Coffey, S. Delamont, J. Lofland and L. Lofland (eds), Handbook of Ethnography, London: Sage

Schwandt, T. [2000] Three Epistemological Stances for Qualitative Inquiry. In N. Denzin and Y. Lincoln (eds) Handbook of Qualitative Research, London: Sage

Scottish Government [2007] Reforming and Revitalising: Report of the Review of Community Penalties, Edinburgh: Scottish Government

– [2008] Protecting Scotland's Communities: Fair, Fast and Flexible Justice, Edinburgh: Scottish Government

– [2010a] About the Community Payback Order, Edinburgh: Scottish Government

– [2010b] National Outcomes and Standards for Social Work Services in the Criminal Justice System: Community Payback Orders Practice Guidance, Edinburgh: Scottish Government

– [2012] Community Payback Order: Scottish Government Summary of Local Authority Annual Reports 2011-12, Edinburgh: Scottish Government

– [2016] National Strategy for Community Justice, Edinburgh: Scottish Government

– [2017a] Community Payback Order: Scottish Government Summary of Local Authority Annual Reports 2015-16, Edinburgh: Scottish Government

– [2017b] Justice in Scotland: Vision and Priorities, Edinburgh: Scottish Government

– [2018] Criminal Justice Social Work Statistics in Scotland: 2016-17,
Edinburgh: Scottish Government

Scottish Prisons Commission [2008] Scotland's Choice: Report of the
Scottish Prisons Commission, Edinburgh: Scottish Government

Scottish Prison Service [2013] Unlocking Potential: Report of the Scottish
Prison Service Organisational Review, Edinburgh: Scottish Prison Service

Semmens, N. [2011] Methodological Approaches to Criminological Research.
In P. Davies, P. Francis and V. Jupp (eds), *Doing Criminological Research*,
London: Sage

Senior, P. [2013] Community Engagement: Innovation Past, Present and
Future, *Probation Journal* 60(3): 242-258

Sherman, L.W. 1993] Defiance, Deterrence and Irrelevance: A Theory of the
Criminal Sanction, *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 30(4): 445-
73

Silverman, D. [2001] *Interpreting Qualitative Data: Methods for Analysing
Talk, Text and Interaction*, London: Sage

– [2011] *Qualitative Research* (3rd Edition), London: Sage

Simons, H. [2009] *Case Study Research in Practice*, London: Sage

Sorsby, A. [2006] Situating Restorative Justice Within Criminal Justice,
Theoretical Criminology 10(4): 505-532

Souhami, A. [2007] Transforming Youth Justice: Occupational Identity and Cultural Change, Cullompton: Willan

– [2015] Creating the Youth Justice Board: Policy and Policy Making in English and Welsh Youth Justice, *Criminology and Criminal Justice* 15(2): 152-168

Sparks, R., A.E. Bottoms and W. Hay [1996] Prisons and the Problem of Order, Oxford: Clarendon

Spencer, J.W. [1987] Self-Work in Social Interaction: Negotiating Role-Identities, *Social Psychology Quarterly* 50(2): 131-142

Spencer, J. and J. Deakin [2004] Community Reintegration: For Whom?. In G. Mair (ed), What Matters in Probation, Cullompton: Devon

Stake, R.E. [1995] The Art of Case Study Research, London: Sage

Stokkom, B. [2002] Moral Emotions in Restorative Justice Conferences: Managing Shame, Designing Empathy, *Theoretical Criminology* 6(3): 339-360

Trotter, C. [2008] Pro-Social Modelling. In G. McIvor and P. Raynor (eds), Developments in Social Work with Offenders, London: Jessica Kingsley

Ugwudike, P. [2010] Compliance with Community Penalties: the Importance of Interactional Dynamics. In F. McNeill, P. Raynor and C. Trotter (eds), Offender Supervision: New Directions in Theory, Research and Practice, Abingdon: Willan

Van de Walle, S. [2009] Confidence in the Criminal Justice System: Does

Experience Count? *British Journal of Criminology* 49(3): 384-98

Van Ness, D. [2014] *Restoring Justice: An Introduction to Restorative Justice*, Waltham, MA: Anderson

Von Hirsch, A. [1998] *Rehabilitation*. In A. Von Hirsch and A. Ashworth (eds), *Principled Sentencing: Readings on Theory and Policy* (2nd Edition), Oxford: Hart

Ward, T. [2010] *The Good Lives Model of Offender Rehabilitation: Basic Assumptions, Aetiological Commitment and Practice Implications*. In F. McNeill, P. Raynor and C. Trotter (eds), *Offender Supervision: New Directions in Theory, Research and Practice*, Abingdon: Willan

Ward, T. and M. Brown [2004] *The Good Lives Model and Conceptual Issues in Offender Rehabilitation*, *Psychology, Crime & Law* 10(3): 243-257

Weaver, B. and S. Armstrong [2011] *User Views of Punishment – The Dynamics of Community-Based Punishment: Insider Views from the Outside*, SCCJR Research Report No.03/2011

Wiles, R., G. Crow, S. Heath and V. Charles [2008] *The Management of Confidentiality and Anonymity in Social Research*, *Social Research Methodology* 11(5): 417-428

Worrall, A. and C. Hoy [2005] *Punishment in the Community: Managing Offenders, Making Choices*. In G. McIvor and P. Raynor (eds), *Developments in Social Work with Offenders*, London: Jessica Kingsley

Yaneklovich [1991] *Coming to Public Judgement: Making Democracy Work in a Complex World*, Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press

Young, W. [1979] Community Service Orders: The Development and Use of a New Penal Measure, London: Heinemann Educational

Yin, R.K. [2014] Case Study Research: Design and Methods, London: Sage